Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86-79
H. R. 7176

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 7176 1
Digest of Public Law 86-79 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 7176

May 15, 1959	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 7176. H. Report No. 366. Print of bill and report.
May 19, 1959	Digest of certain provisions of H. R. 7176 as reported by House committee.
May 25, 1959	House began and concluded debate on H. R. 7176.
May 27, 1959	House passed H. R. 7176 without amendment.
May 28, 1959	H. R. 7176 was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
June 18, 1959	Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 7176.
June 22, 1959	Senate committee reported H. R. 7176 with amendments. S. Report No. 422. Print of bill and report.
June 23, 1959	Senate made H. R. 7176 unfinished business.
June 24, 1959	Senate passed H. R. 7176 as reported.
	Senate conferees appointed.
	Print of bill as passed by Senate.
June 29, 1959	House agreed to Senate amendment with an amendment.
	Senate agreed to House amendment.
July 8, 1959	Approved: Public Law 86-79.

Hearings: House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-79

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION ACT, 1960. Includes appropations for the Budget Bureau, Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council, President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, Emergency Fund of the President (National Defense), and Subversive Activities Control Board.

Appropriates $125,000 to the President for allocation to executive agencies for the conduct, under the general direction of the Bureau of the Budget, of examinations and appraisals of, and the development and installation of improvements in, the organizations and operations of the agencies.

Includes general provisions for departments and agencies, during the fiscal year 1960 as follows: Limits the amount which may be paid for a passenger vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances) to $1,500, except for station wagons the maximum of which is $1,950. Requires Federal employees to be U. S. citizens, with certain exceptions. Makes appropriations available for living quarters allowances for employees stationed in foreign countries. Prohibits payments to employees whose nominations the Senate has rejected. Limits the price which may be paid for the U. S. Code to $4 per volume, and for the Lifetime Federal Digest to $4.25 per volume. In the case of certain corporations, makes appropriations available for certain purposes, such as rent in D. C. Prohibits corporations from constructing office buildings in certain cases.. Permits foreign credits to be used only when reimbursement is made to the Treasury Department. Requires departments and agencies, in connection with the submission of all requests for proposed appropriations to the Budget Bureau, to submit reports that statements of obligations furnished therewith consist of valid obligations in accord with definitions in Sec. 1311 (a) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1955.

86th Congress } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { Report
1st Session } { No. 366

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

May 15, 1959.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. Andrews, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7176]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Summary of the Bill

The estimates considered by the committee are contained in the Budget for 1960 on pages 64–67, 72, 73, 84, 85, 89, 127, 128, 169, 170, and 203. In addition to the appropriation estimates, the Committee considered general provisions of a governmentwide character presented on pages 73 and 74 of the Budget.

Appropriations recommended in the bill total $13,338,500, a decrease of $270,000 in the estimates. The amounts recommended are an increase of $173,130 over 1959 after inclusion of supplemental appropriations in the amount of $520,500 contained in H.R. 5916 (Second Supplemental, 1959) as agreed to in the Conference Report. The estimates, and the amounts recommended by the Committee, contemplate average employment of 1,561 in 1960 compared with an average of 1,636 for 1959. The principal reductions in employment are in the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, whose workloads are declining. A

tabulation of the items included in the accompanying bill appears at the end of this report.

Executive Office of the President

The Committee recommends appropriations of $10,255,500 for the Executive Office of the President, the amount of the estimates. This is an increase of $343,630 over 1959 after inclusion of supplemental appropriations in the amount of $457,000 contained in H.R. 5916 (Second Supplemental, 1959) as agreed to in the Conference Report.

Appropriations for the Executive Office of the President provide for the following items: Compensation of the President, The White House Office, Special Projects, Executive Mansion and Grounds, Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council, and the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization. Increases over amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year are included in this bill for all items except Compensation of the President, the White House Office, and the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The National Security Council offices in the Executive Office Building are guarded under arrangement with the General Services Administration. Funds for the Secret Service, contained in another appropriation bill, provide for a special corps of guards to protect a section of the Executive Office Building containing certain segments of the White House Office. It would not appear that the records of those offices are in any way more sensitive and more critical than are the records of the National Security Council, and the Committee has questioned whether there is consistency, logic, or economy in the extension of the White House Police into the Executive Office Building. It does not seem to make sense to have a corps of guards wearing one kind of uniform guarding offices and files and records on one floor of the Executive Office Building while another corps of guards wearing a somewhat different uniform performs comparable services on another floor of the same building. This inconsistency is particularly disturbing when the special guard service justified in the case of the White House Police is for offices and records apparently no more sensitive and critical than are being guarded adequately by the General Services Administration. The Committee has received strong assurances that the Executive Office of the President will not permit its administration of these housekeeping duties to become an example of duplication and confusion.

Funds Appropriated to the President

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000, the amount of the estimate and the same as the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The Committee continues to support the proposition that the President should have available such a fund from which he may, in his discretion, provide for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense. However, this fund has been used with some

frequency to initiate projects, committees, and agencies which lend themselves to perpetuation long beyond defensible pretext of emergency.

Witnesses speaking in behalf of this fund enumerated several studies, conducted under recent appropriations, which do not appear to meet the criteria justified by the Administration and approved by the Congress. A case in point is a recent study of the mutual security program which has been presented to the Congress annually for more than a decade and given the most thorough consideration by a major legislative Committee and the Committee on Appropriations.

In recommending an appropriation in the full amount requested, the Committee hopes that the utmost restraint will be exercised in the use of this fund for the purposes intended as stated in the appropriation language.

EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

The action of the Committee in denying the budget estimate of $250,000 requested for this item should not be construed as a reduction of the program. The budget indicates that an unobligated balance of $211,000 will be available on July 1, 1959. This amount will be adequate for planned requirements of $161,000 in fiscal year 1960 and leave a carryover into 1961 of $50,000. Under these circumstances, an additional appropriation at this time would seem to be premature.

American Battle Monuments Commission

The bill includes the amount of the budget estimate, $1,295,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission. This is an increase of $27,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The recommended amount provides for mandatory salary increases and for an increase of 12 in average employment as the completion of the construction program brings more maintenance work upon the Commission. The increase in average employment under this administrative account is more than offset by a decrease of 54 in average employment under the construction account.

An unobligated balance of $4,238,664 remained in the construction account as of December 31, 1958. The bill includes a new proviso which will authorize the Commission to use a portion of this unobligated balance for the purpose of conducting certain dedication ceremonies during fiscal year 1960.

The program for providing next of kin with a color photograph, suitable for framing, of the cemetery in which the deceased rests or is listed as missing, is now well underway. More than 2,000 photographs have been provided to next of kin. Descriptive pamphlets are also available, each with a narrative and pictorial review of an area of war and its cemetery. They comprise the only tangible remembrance that many a parent or next of kin will have of the serviceman concerned.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

The bill includes the budget estimate of $408,000 for direct appropriation to this Commission, to be augmented by $50,000 from the War Claims Fund. As compared with the fiscal year 1959, the total amount recommended for 1960 ($458,000) is a reduction of $244,300, of which $41,800 is attributable to reduced transfer from the War Claims Fund, and $202,500 represents a decrease in the appropriation out of general funds of the Treasury.

Testimony indicated that the Commission is now working on five different claims programs which will be completed during fiscal year 1960. The Commission is about to open activities on a sixth—the Czechoslovakian program.

Subversive Activities Control Board

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $380,000, a reduction of $20,000 in the estimate and an increase of $5,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The reduction in the estimates is based on decreases in workload which have materialized since the budget was submitted, based on the recent action by the Attorney General in requesting dismissal of a major case.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and upon application by the Attorney General or by any organization or individual covered by the Act determines whether any such organization is a "Communist-action organization", a "Communist-front organization" or a "Communist-infiltrated organization" within the meaning of the Act as amended and whether any such individual is a member of any communist-action organization or an officer of a communist-front organization registered or by final order of the Board required to be registered under the Act as amended.

The Board entered a registration order against the Communist Party on April 20, 1953. The Supreme Court remanded the case to the Board on credibility questions involving three Government witnesses and, in so doing, declined to pass on the constitutionality of the Act. Pending final judicial determination on the basic question of constitutionality, the Control Board and the lower courts cannot bring other cases to a satisfactory conclusion.

The Communist Party and the various subversive organizations have employed every maneuver to delay and evade, and have succeeded over the years in thwarting the program of this Control Board and the intent of the Congress in passing subversive control legislation. The action of the Supreme Court, in remanding on technicalities without passing on the fundamental issue, has denied the Control Board any effective means of carrying out its responsibilities.

The Committee is recommending an appropriation adequate to enable the Control Board to meet its responsibilities and is hopeful that a judicial determination on the issue of constitutionality will be forthcoming at the earliest possible date, thereby enabling the Board to implement fully the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act.

General Provisions

The bill recommends continuation of numerous general provisions, unchanged from the Act for the fiscal year 1959. There has been deleted the provision carried in that Act as Section 208, relating to requirements and reports under the provisions of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–45, dated June 3, 1952. That Section of the General Provisions had served its purpose and is no longer required.

The Committee has included language in the bill, section 210, to eliminate annual agency reports to the Committees on Appropriations, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office pursuant to Section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as to obligated and unobligated balances under each appropriation and fund of the agency. These special reports, required not later than September 30 as to status of balances on June 30 preceding, were a necessary feature of Section 1311 which, for the first time, comprehensively defined an obligation of the Government for accounting, budgeting, and reporting purposes. They have served their purpose and can now be dispensed with.

The proposition in the bill is to substitute for the present reports a simple report to the Budget Bureau, when submitting requests for appropriations, that statements of obligations furnished therewith consist of valid obligations in accord with definitions in subsection (a) of Section 1311.

Under the law, the figures on obligated and unobligated balances shown in the annual Budget document are required to accord with Section 1311 definitions. That would continue, as would the requirement that any other statement of obligations furnished by any agency to the Congress or committee thereof include only such amounts as may be valid obligations under the law.

Limitations and Legislative Provisions

The following legislative provision not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill is recommended:

On page 6, line 13 in connection with American Battle Monuments Commission:

> *Not to exceed $160,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for necessary expenses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II memorials, erected under the authority of the Act of July 25, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 123), including travel and such other purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper, and each amount may be expended without regard to the provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Account-*

ing Office for audit): Provided, That, when in the discretion of the head of any other government agency it would be in the public interest, personnel, services, supplies, equipment, and facilities of such agency may be furnished without reimbursement to the Commission for the purposes of these dedications.

Compliance With Rule XIII—Clause 3

The following is submitted in compliance with clause 3, of rule XIII:

PENDING BILL	EXISTING LAW
(On page 13, line 10)	(68 Stat. 830; 31 U S.C. 200(b))
Sec. 210. (a) Section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C. 200(b)) is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in connection with the submission of all requests for proposed appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obligations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as defined in subsection (a) hereof."	(b) Not later than September 30 of each year, the head of each Federal agency shall report, as to each appropriation or fund under the control of such agency, the amount thereof remaining obligated but unexpended and the amount thereof remaining unobligated on June 30 of such year and copies of such report shall be forwarded by him to the chairman of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
(On page 13, line 18)	(70 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701(c))
(b) Section 1(c) of the act of July 25, 1956, (70 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701(c)), is amended by striking the words "reported pursuant to section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C. 200(b))," ...	(c) For the purposes of this Act, the obligated balance of an appropriation account as of the close of the fiscal year shall be the amount of unliquidated obligations applicable to such appropriation less the amount collectible as repayments to the appropriation; the unobligated balance shall represent the difference between the obligated balance reported pursuant to section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C. 200(b)), and the total unexpended balance. Collections authorized to be credited to an appropriation but not received until after the transfer of the obligated appropriation balance as required by

PENDING BILL	EXISTING LAW
	subsection (a) (1) of this Act, shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the account into which the obligated balance has been transferred, except that any collection made by the General Accounting Office for other Government agencies may be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959, AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1960

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Estimates, 1960	Recommended in bill for 1960	Bill compared with—	
				1959 appropriation	1960 estimates
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Compensation of the President	$150, 000	$150, 000	$150, 000		
The White House Office	2, 222, 000	2, 221, 000	2, 221, 000	−$1, 000	
Special projects	1, 329, 970	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	+170, 030	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	449, 400	475, 000	475, 000	+25, 600	
Bureau of the Budget	4, 550, 600	4, 665, 000	4, 665, 000	+114, 400	
Council of Economic Advisers	393, 000	395, 000	395, 000	+2, 000	
National Security Council	759, 400	792, 000	792, 000	+32, 600	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	57, 500	57, 500	57, 500		
Total, Executive Office of the President	9, 911, 870	10, 255, 500	10, 255, 500	+343, 630	
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Emergency fund for the President, National defense	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000		
Expenses of management improvement		250, 000			−$250, 000
Total, Funds Appropriated to the President	1, 000, 000	1, 250, 000	1, 000, 000		−250, 000

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	1, 268, 000	1, 295, 000	1, 295, 000	+27, 000	----------
Construction of memorials and cemeteries	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Total, American Battle Monuments Commission	1, 268, 000	1, 295, 000	1, 295, 000	+27, 000	----------
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	[3] 610, 500	[4] 408, 000	[4] 408, 000	−202, 500	----------
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	375, 000	400, 000	380, 000	+5, 000	−20, 000
Grand total	13, 165, 370	13, 608, 500	13, 338, 500	+173, 130	−270, 000

[1] Including amounts in H.R. 5916 (Second Supplemental, 1959) agreed to in the Conference Report.
[2] Language only.
[3] Plus $91,800 from war claims fund.
[4] Plus $50,000 from war claims fund.

O

Union Calendar No. 139

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

[Report No. 366]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 15, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Execu-
5 tive Office of the President and sundry general Goverment
6 agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

4 For compensation of the President, including an expense
5 allowance at the rate of $50,000 per annum as authorized
6 by the Act of January 19, 1949 (3 U.S.C. 102), $150,000.

7 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary for The White House Office,
10 including not to exceed $215,000 for services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
12 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as
13 the President may specify, and other personal services
14 without regard to the provisions of law regulating the em-
15 ployment and compensation of persons in the Government
16 service; newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and
17 travel, and official entertainment expenses of the President,
18 to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $2,221,000.

19 SPECIAL PROJECTS

20 For expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the
21 President in connection with special projects, to be expended
22 in his discretion and without regard to such provisions of
23 law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the
24 compensation and employment of persons in the Government
25 service as he may specifiy, $1,500,000: *Provided,* That not

1 to exceed 10 per centum of this appropriation may be used
2 to reimburse the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,
3 The White House Office", for administrative services.

4 EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

5 For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refur-
6 nishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including elec-
7 tric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the
8 Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be
9 expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding
10 the provisions of this or any other Act, $475,000.

11 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget,
14 including not to exceed $110,000 for expenses of travel, and
15 not to exceed $20,000 for services as authorized by section
16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
17 not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $4,665,000.

18 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out
21 its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C.
22 1021), including newspapers and periodicals (not exceed-
23 ing $400); not exceeding $15,000 for expenses of travels
24 and press clippings (not exceeding $300); $395,000.

1 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the National Security
4 Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
6 in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; and acceptance
7 and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services;
8 $792,000.

9 PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
10 ORGANIZATION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the President's Advisory
13 Committee on Government Organization, established by
14 Executive Order 10432 of January 24, 1953, including serv-
15 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
16 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem
17 for individuals, $57,500.

18 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

19 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT,
20 NATIONAL DEFENSE

21 For expenses necessary to enable the President, through
22 such officers or agencies of the Government as he may desig-
23 nate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding
24 the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation
25 and employment of persons in the Government service as

he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, $1,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Eighty-sixth Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions; not to exceed $70,000 for expenses of travel; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; $1,295,000: *Provided,* That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be author-

1 ized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Com-
2 mission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this
3 appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of
4 such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on
5 business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces
6 serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may
7 be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian mem-
8 bers of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Com-
9 mission shall reimburse other Government agencies, includ-
10 ing the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of
11 personnel assigned to it.

12 CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

13 Not to exceed $160,000 of funds heretofore appropri-
14 ated under this head shall be available for necessary ex-
15 penses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II
16 memorials, erected under the authority of the Act of July
17 25, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 123), including travel and such other
18 purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper,
19 and such amount may be expended without regard to the
20 provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the ex-
21 penditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall
22 not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submis-
23 sion of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting
24 Office for audit): *Provided*, That, when in the discretion

1 of the head of any other Government agency it would be in
2 the public interest, personnel, services, supplies, equipment,
3 and facilities of such agency may be furnished without reim-
4 bursement to the Commission for the purposes of these dedi-
5 cations.

6 During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $5,000 of
7 funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be avail-
8 able for travel expenses (other than in connection with
9 dedications of memorials).

10 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary to carry on the activities of the
13 Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services
14 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
15 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for in-
16 dividuals; not to exceed $12,000 for expenses of travel;
17 advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies
18 for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the
19 functions of the Commission; hire of motor vehicles for field
20 use only; and employment of aliens; $458,000, of which
21 $50,000 shall be derived only from the war claims fund
22 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
23 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948) and not to be
24 available for obligation after June 30, 1960.

1 SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities
4 Control Board, including services as authorized by section
5 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to
6 exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed
7 $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals,
8 $380,000.

9 TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

11 SEC. 201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
12 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
13 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
15 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed
16 at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum
17 shall be $1,950.

18 SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-
19 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in
20 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation
21 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United
22 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of
23 which is owned by the Government of the United States)
24 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless
25 such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a

1 person in the service of the United States on the date of
2 enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had
3 filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the
4 United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes
5 allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from the
6 Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for
7 permanent residence: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this
8 section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be con-
9 sidered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this
10 section with respect to his status have been complied with:
11 *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit
12 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined
13 not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one
14 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause
15 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
16 provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any pay-
17 ment made to any officer or employee contrary to the
18 provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the
19 Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citi-
20 zens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of
21 those countries allied with the United States in the current
22 defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators,
23 or to temporary employment in the field service (not to
24 exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

1 SEC. 203. Appropriations of the executive departments
2 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
3 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
4 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
5 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
6 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
7 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
8 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
9 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
10 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
11 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
12 tries: *Provided,* That the availability of appropriations made
13 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
14 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
15 hereby.

16 SEC. 204. No part of any appropriation for the current
17 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid
18 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or
19 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to
20 approve the nomination of said person.

21 SEC. 205. No part of any appropriation contained in
22 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be
23 used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and
24 future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and
25 such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the

1 understanding that latest published cumulative annual
2 pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be
3 furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume
4 for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal
5 Digest.

6 SEC. 206. Funds made available by this or any other
7 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year
8 of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
9 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),
10 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
11 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia;
12 services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August
13 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under
14 this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable
15 to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified
16 in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,*
17 That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative
18 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other
19 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be
20 correspondingly reduced.

21 SEC. 207. No part of any funds of or available to any
22 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
23 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
24 purchase or construction of any office building, without
25 specific authority in law therefor, primarily for occupancy

1 by any department or agency of the United States Govern-
2 ment or by any corporation owned by the United States
3 Government.

4 SEC. 208. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of
5 July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including
6 currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may
7 be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which
8 appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including
9 the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of
10 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made
11 to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency
12 concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange
13 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be
14 used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar
15 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by
16 law, without reimbursement to the Treasury: *Provided*
17 *further,* That nothing in section 1415 of the Act of
18 July 15, 1952, or in this section shall be construed
19 to prevent the making of new or the carrying out
20 of existing contracts, agreements, or executive agree-
21 ments for periods in excess of one year, in any case
22 where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements
23 for periods in excess of one year were permitted prior to the
24 enactment of this Act under section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus
25 Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1641

1 (b) (2)), and the performance of all such contracts, agree-
2 ments, or executive agreements shall be subject to the avail-
3 ability of appropriations for the purchase of credits as
4 provided by law.

5 SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation contained in
6 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
7 individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act,
8 shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed
9 to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

10 SEC. 210. (a) Section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental
11 Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C.
12 200 (b)), is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in con-
13 nection with the submission of all requests for proposed
14 appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of
15 each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obli-
16 gations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as
17 defined in subsection (a) hereof."

18 (b) Section 1 (c) of the Act of July 25, 1956 (70
19 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701 (c)), is amended by striking the
20 words "reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supple-
21 mental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C.
22 200 (b))."

23 SEC. 211. This Act may be cited as the "General Gov-
24 ernment Matters Appropriation Act, 1960".

Union Calendar No. 139

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

[Report No. 366]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDREWS

MAY 15, 1959

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

H. R. 7176

A BILL

May 19, 1959

14. WATER; TRANSPORTATION. Received 4 reports made by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on the Great Lakes Harbor Study -- interim reports on the Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio, (H. Doc. 148); on Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (H. Doc. 149); on Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis. (H. Doc. 150); on Buffalo Harbor, N. Y. (H. Doc. 151). p. 7679

15. BANKING. Rep. Brown, Ga., inserted a summary of his bill H. R. 6092, relating to national banks and obligations secured by certain staples and dairy cattle. pp. 7673-4

16. HOUSING. Began debate on S. 57, the housing bill reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee, and H. R. 7117, the Herlong housing bill, both of which presently contain sections on farm housing research. pp. 7624-73, 7674-5

17. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. As reported (see Digest 79), this bill includes items for the Budget Bureau, Council of Economic Advisers, President's Advisory Committee on Government Reorganization, and President's management improvement fund. It also contains provisions described in the committee report as follows:

"The bill recommends continuation of numerous general provisions, unchanged from the Act for the fiscal year 1959. There has been deleted the provisions carried in that Act as Section 208, relating to requirements and reports under the provisions of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-45, dated June 3, 1952. That Section of the General Provisions had served its purpose and is no longer required.

"The Committee has included language in the bill, section 210, to eliminate annual agency reports to the Committees on Appropriations, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office pursuant to Section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as to obligated and unobligated balances under each appropriation and fund of the agency. These special reports, required not later than September 30 as to status of balances on June 30 preceding, were a necessary feature of Section 1311 which, for the first time, comprehensively defined an obligation of the Government for accounting, budgeting, and reporting purposes. They have served their purpose and can now be dispensed with.

"The proposition in the bill is to substitute for the present reports a simple report to the Budget Bureau, when submitting requests for appropriations, that statements of obligations furnished therewith consist of valid obligations in accord with definitions in subsection (a) of Section 1311.

"Under the law, the figures on obligated and unobligated balances shown in the annual Budget document are required to accord with Section 1311 definitions. That would continue, as would the requirement that any other statement of obligations furnished by any agency to the Congress or committee thereof include only such amounts as may be valid obligations under the law."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Fulbright inserted an article, "Shock Treatment," which favors Sen. Mansfield's proposal for a thorough reexamination of the administration of the foreign aid program. pp. A4166-7

19. WHEAT. Sen. Langer inserted a constituent's letter suggesting that everyone make homemade bread to dispose of the wheat surplus. pp. A4167-8

20. FORESTS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Neuberger commending this Deparment's report, "A Program for the National Forests," and inserting an editorial discussing this report. p. A4168

Sen. Mundt inserted a constituent's essay, "Conservation of America's Forest." pp. A4174-5

21. COOPERATIVES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Carlson inserting an address by Fred R. Merrifield, Pres., Wichita Bank for Cooperatives, "How Do the Banks for Cooperatives Loans Fit into Growth and Expansion Programs for Farmer Cooperatives?" and stating that the address "explains fully the many benefits that accrue to those who participate in the program of the Farm Credit Administration." pp. A4168-70

22. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Saltonstall inserting an editorial, "As the Farm Program Totters Toward Collapse," and stating that "it is an excellent tribute to a man who has fought hard to improve our farm economy -- Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson." pp. A4170-1

Rep. Adair inserted an editorial discussing Sen. Capehart's proposed farm bill. p. A4182

Extension of remarks of Rep. Adair inserting an editorial suggesting that Secretary Benson "be given an opportunity to try his plans to improve our agricultural situation." p. A4188

Extension of remarks of Rep. Broomfield stating that "the scope and waste of our Federal agriculture subsidy program has become a disgrace to our Nation and a tremendous burden upon the pocketbooks of our taxpayers," and inserting an article, "Crop Surplus Is Costing United States Billions." pp. A4202-3

23. COTTON. Extension of remarks of Sen. Proxmire inserting an editorial, "Millions To Reclaim Land for Cotton We Do Not Need," and stating that the editorial expresses "vigorous indignation" at the action taken by the Senate in passing the proposed San Luis reclamation project. p. A4173

24. INFLATION. Sen. Byrd, Va., inserted a bulletin issued by the American Farm Bureau, "Inflation Is Eating Us Up," and his article printed in the Reader's Digest, "Can We Escape A Ruinous Inflation?." pp. A4180-2, A4183-4

25. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Proxmire inserted a magazine article, "Monopoly in the Milkshed," and stated that it "reports how the mergers and acquisitions by the dairy giants have enabled them to enjoy an unparalleled period of soaring profits during the very period when dairy farmer income has dropped disastrously and housewives have had to pay ever more for milk and dairy products." pp. A4185-7

Rep. Johnson, Wisc., inserted an article discussing provisions of his and Sen. Humphrey's dairy stabilization bills. p. A4204

26. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Van Zandt inserted an editorial, "Our Depressed Areas Need Action, Not Runaround." pp. A4187-8

27. EGGS. Rep. St. George inserted a letter from a constituent and stated that "I think that he has come up with an interesting answer, namely, that Government supports only increase the number of the inefficient, penalize, and finally force liquidation on the efficient and hard-working poultryman, and finally take away the farmer's freedom." pp. A4190-1

28. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Speeches in the House by Reps. Schwengel and Hoffman discussing this bill, H. R. 7175. pp. A4201-2, A4207-8

29. SUBSIDIES. Rep. Hiestand inserted an editorial, opposing Federal subsidies, including farm subsidies. p. A4209

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 26, 1959
For actions of May 25, 1959
86th-1st, No. 84

CONTENTS

Agricultural sciences....3
Alaska.....15,18
Appropriations.2,3,4,16,19
ASC committees.....15
Centennial celebration..17
Committee assignments...11
Committee reports.....13
Conservation reserve....15
Contracts.....5,15
Credit unions.....9,27
Disaster relief.....12
Education.....15,22
Employment.....2
Export control.....14
FAO.....3
Farm program.....10,21
Farm state.....25
Federal aid.....32
Feed grains.....6
Fish and wildlife.....15
Food for peace.....30
Foreign affairs.....22
Forestry.....15
Holidays.....7
Imports.....24
Inflation.....26
International organizations.....3
Labeling.....29
Lands.....33
Legislative program.....16
Milk and cream.....15
Organization.....2
Personnel.....7,31
Price supports.....6
Property.....15
Renegotiation.....16
Retirement.....31
River development.....23
Rural development.....20
School aid.....15
School lunch.....19
Sugar.....3,15
Surplus commodities.....30
Timber.....15
Transportation.....28
Water pollution.....8
Wheat.....1,3,10,21

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 5.

HOUSE

1. WHEAT. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7246, to revise acreage allotments and price supports for wheat (H. Rept. 384). pp. 8139, 8087

2. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Began and concluded debate on this bill, H. R. 7176 (pp. 8096-8112). The vote on passage of the bill was postponed until Wed., May 27 (p. 8112).

Rejected, 15 to 26, an amendment by Rep. Gross to strike out an item of $57,500 for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization (p. 8104).

Rejected, 19 to 57, an amendment by Rep. O'Hara to permit agencies to use appropriated funds to employ any aliens lawfully admitted to the U. S. for permanent residence. (p. 8111)

3. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 7343 pp. 8112-28

Rejected an amendment by Rep. Gross to reduce from $48,033,000 to $30,033,000 the appropriation for contributions to international organizations. p. 8123

As reported (see Digest 82), this bill includes $2,997,489 for the Food and Agriculture Organization and also funds for the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, International Sugar Council, and International Wheat

Council. The committee report includes the following statement:

"The Committee again expresses its concern over the ever increasing budgets of the International Organizations. Our representatives to these organizations should make every effort to prevent these large increases in budgets, and should exercise strong leadership in weeding our marginal activities by keeping the organizations oriented to the primary objectives for which they were created.

"Every effort should be made to use foreign credits rather than American dollars wherever possible."

4. COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H. R. 7349 (H. Rept. 377). p. 8139

5. CONTRACTS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 4 years, until June 30, 1963. p. 8139

6. FEED GRAINS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee "Completed hearings but took no action on the granting of a rule on H. R. 5432, re adjustment of price supports for feed grains. Witnesses heard were Representatives Poage and Hoeven." p. D393

7. PERSONNEL. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee "Completed hearing but took no action on the granting of a rule on H. R. 5752, re observance of legal holidays by Federal employees" which occur on Sat. pp. D393-4

8. WATER POLLUTION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3610, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act so as to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works and to establish an Office of Water Pollution Control. p. D393

9. CREDIT UNIONS. A subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee voted to report with amendment H. R. 5777, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act. p. D393

10. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Hoffman discussed the case of Stanley Yankus, who sold his farm and moved to Australia allegedly because of penalties assessed against him for exceeding his wheat acreage allotments, stated that "It is an acknowledged fact that the program has failed," and inserted an editorial, "Controlling Farm Prices Leads to Controlling Farmers." p. 8118

11. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Agreed to a resolution electing Rep. Robert W. Levering a member of the Agriculture Committee, and Rep. James C. Oliver a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 8087

12. DISASTER RELIEF. Received from the President a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, which authorizes Federal aid to State and local governments in major disasters (H. Doc. 157). p. 8095

13. COMMITTEE REPORTS. The Rules Committee was granted permission until midnight, May 25, "to file certain reports." p. 8112

14. EXPORT CONTROL. Received from the Commerce Department a quarterly report "as required under the Export Control Act of 1949." p. 8138

many around the free world, not necessarily because they have agreed with Mr. Dulles, but because they have admired his courage and unswerving devotion to his principles.

Yet there must be great satisfaction to the outgoing Secretary that he leaves his office at a time when his reputation is at a pinnacle. The storms of previous years that blew around him have largely dissipated, and doubts and discord have been replaced with real affection—as much abroad as at home. No doubt much of this respect has been focused by Mr. Dulles' position on Berlin and the German problem. But much also has stemmed from recognition of his steadfast adherence to his convictions. Perhaps it took the Berlin crisis and Mr. Dulles' illness to demonstrate what a source of strength he has epitomized. He has been the towering figure, not merely in the Eisenhower administration, but also in the Western Alliance.

It is unnecessary, in a current appraisal of Mr. Dulles' 6 years as Secretary of State, to gloss over the points of past criticism. Mr. Dulles himself would not appreciate that. Some of the disagreements loom small in retrospect. Others represent basic differences of approach. On many points his strategy has seemed better than his tactics.

There was, for example, the much-publicized philosophy of brinkmanship, which Mr. Dulles himself must take responsibility for having advertised. Certainly it caused far more apprehension than public expression of the concept was worth, even as a tool for coping with the Kremlin's machinations. There was the doctrine of massive retaliation which, insofar as Mr. Dulles voiced it, has shown itself to be far from an adequate posture of defense. There was the flirtation with liberation, a phony partisan slogan which disclosed a scarcely creditable side of Mr. Dulles.

There also were such excesses of speech as the Goa statement, Mr. Dulles' various pronouncements about neutralism and his occasionally effusive invocations of morality. There was the silly episode in which he refused to permit American reporters to go to Communist China. There were exercises in legalism and attempts to camouflage old policies with Madison Avenue veneer. There was the justified complaint that Mr. Dulles made too little use of staff and encouraged only negligible long-range planning.

But there also were moments of greatness, as when Mr. Dulles recommended the searingly difficult decision to oppose the British-French intervention at Suez. Having played a part in precipitating the crisis by the blunt manner of his withdrawal of help for the Aswan Dam, and having contributed to the estrangement of Britain and France, Mr. Dulles worked with enormous earnestness to heal the split and repair the damage. His course helped preserve the usefulness of the United Nations, and it may also have prevented world war.

After years of opposition to any acknowledgment of Communist China, last autumn Mr. Dulles did make a major change of policy by disavowing Chiang Kai-shek's ambitions on the mainland. The United States is not yet out of its dubious Quemoy involvement, but in the circumstances the Dulles stand seemed to deter Communist aggression. However unclear the purpose at the time, the American intervention in Lebanon brought a measure of stability in the Near East. Mr. Dulles also must receive applause for what in the net is a good record of economic responsibility in world affairs on the part of the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, of course, there is the issue of Germany. Mr. Dulles combined firmness on the military position with a willingness to discuss various possible approaches to larger agreement. In this he showed awareness of the importance of turning the onus on the Soviet Union. The recent squabbles among the Western allies illustrate how much Mr. Dulles is missed.

At the same time it can fairly be said that there has been no marked advance in the Western position under Mr. Dulles' leadership. He has been an apostle, as it were, of containment. The various pacts he erected in Asia and the Middle East—pactomania, his policy was called—were aimed at preserving the status quo. There is wide agreement with his thesis that the Communists will make trouble wherever there is weakness, but he displayed little or no initiative to try to roll the Communists back or negotiate a stabilization.

In part Mr. Dulles' approach has appeared to derive from his conviction that because communism is evil the Communist society eventually will crack up. There is little disagreement that communism is evil, but there is little evidence either, that the Soviet state is in fact cracking up. On the contrary, most of the evidence indicates that it poses an increasing challenge which is still too little appreciated in either economic or military terms.

There have been few settlements under Mr. Dulles, and in some places—notably in Indochina in 1954 and now in Iraq—the Western interest has been set back. Yet containment, or preservation of the status quo, is no mean achievement. Perhaps it is all that could have been achieved. Mr. Dulles' approach has been essentially conservative, but it is useless to argue whether more initiative would have produced happier results. No one can prove his course wrong.

Certainly the Secretary demonstrated the capacity to grow in his job. He fought many unsung battles within the administration, on nuclear tests and other issues, without a word of complaint when his hand was suddenly weakened. If he continued to keep policy too much to himself, to be too much the lawyer engaging in brilliant improvisation, he refined many of his techniques and learned to avoid many of his earlier errors.

He won strong supporters among both parties in Congress after his initial experience in making concessions to the Republican right-wing irreconcilables which he probably did not have to make. He seemed to enjoy his frequent meetings with the press and was more adept that any other Cabinet member at using the news conference as a forum. Although he occasionally sacrificed both issues and personalities, he did a great deal to advance the acceptance of internationalism as permanent American policy.

Mr. Dulles learned early that no effective Secretary of State can expect to be popular. He had a curious affinity on many fundamental points, although neither may like the comparison, with his predecessor, Dean Acheson. Above all, he made broad use of a first-rate mind. Whether or not one concurred with his decisions, it was a joy to witness the exercise of his wit and intellectual power.

It is far too close to Mr. Dulles' service to evaluate the significance of his contribution with any depth of perspective. It is clear, however, that his retirement after a diplomatic career that goes back intermittently 52 years to the Hague Peace Conference of 1907 leaves a vast hole that cannot readily be filled. As he marshals his strength for what everyone will hope can be continued service as an adviser, he can be sure that his conscientiousness, energy and dedication have won him the profound gratitude of his countrymen.

PUBLIC LAW 875, 81ST CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. No. 157)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit herewith a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, and required by Section 8 of such Law.

Funds which have been appropriated to accomplish the Federal assistance determined eligible under this authority are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 22, 1959.*

WE MUST NOT LET THE RUSSIANS WIN BY DEFAULT

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, has our American Government departed from our traditional foreign policy of recognition of the right of all nations to national self-determination? At the Foreign Ministers meeting, no voice has been raised on behalf of the rights of the people of the captive non-Russian nations now illegally dominated and controlled by the Russians. Worldwide attention has been diverted from the plight of the enslaved nations. As a consequence, the enslavement of the captive nations is being accepted as status quo on a "de facto" basis. By our failure to insist that the status of the captive nations must be considered on the agenda, the Russians are winning a victory to maintain the status quo, by default. The Russians are trying to break the will to resist of the people in the subjugated nations. We must not, by default, or in any manner, assist the Russians in their determined efforts to break the will to resist of the subjugated people.

I urge President Eisenhower to instruct Secretary of State Herter to demand that the Communist-enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclama-

tion of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House may be permitted to sit in the city of Chicago, hold hearings and take testimony on the 26th, 27th, and 28th of this month during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Commitee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7176, with Mr. ALBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minues.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides funds for the Executive Office of the President and sundry agencies. There are 14 appropriation items in the bill.

Appropriation, 1959	$12,644,870
Supplemental appropriations, 1959	520,500
Total available, 1959	13,165,370
Estimates, 1960	13,608,500
Recommended in bill	13,338,500
Recommended decrease in estimates	270,000
Increase over 1959	173,130

The committee is recommending the full amount requested in the budget estimates for all except two items. The two exceptions are the item for "Expenses of management improvement" and the item for "Salaries and expenses of the Subversive Activities Control Board." These items will be discussed in more detail in a moment, but it should be noted now that the reductions recommended by the committee will not in any way cut back on the work to be carried out under these funds in fiscal year 1960.

AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT

Average employment paid from funds included in this bill will decline from 1,623 in the current fiscal year to 1,561 in fiscal year 1960. This reduction of 75 in average employment was planned in the estimates submitted to the Congress in the President's Budget, and the committee has not recommended any further reductions in personnel. Significant reductions in average employment will occur: In the American Battle Monuments Commission—minus 42—as the construction program nears completion; and in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—minus 32—which will be completing action during fiscal year 1960 on five different claims programs.

THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The committee is recommending the full amount requested in the budget estimates for the Executive Office of the President. This includes the compensation of the President, the White House Office, special projects, the Executive Mansion and Grounds, the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization. The total amount of $10,255,500 is an increase of $343,630 over the comparable amount for the current fiscal year. Practically all of this increase is required to pay increased salaries of existing employees, and there is no increase in average employment—988 in both 1959 and 1960.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL DEFENSE

The bill includes $1 million, the amount requested for the item "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense." There is some doubt that the use of this fund has been restricted to instances of bona fide emergency, but such a fund should be available in case a real need should arise.

EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

The committee is recommending that no appropriation be made this year for the item "Expenses of Management Improvement." This recommendation is based entirely on the carryover of funds already available for this purpose. The budget document shows that an unobligated balance of $211,000 will be on hand in this fund at the beginning of fiscal year 1960, and only $161,000 is planned to be obligated during that year. Actual figures for the current fiscal year show that only $89,928.91 was expended through the first 9 months, leaving an unexpended balance of $336,193.85 in this fund as of April 1, 1959. Thus, it appears that the balance on hand will be more than adequate to take care of any requirements there may be in fiscal year 1960.

In the words of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, "This is an appropriation aimed at saving money, not spending it." The committee recognizes the value of this program of management improvement, but can see no useful purpose in appropriating funds at this time "to restore unallocated funds to approximately the level of the original appropriation of $500,000" as requested in the budget justification.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, what has been accomplished substantially by the money that has been spent on this organization? I have read the hearings of the gentleman's subcommittee, and I cannot find where they can show any real accomplishment for the money expended and the money that you are presently making available as a carryover.

Mr. ANDREWS. I will say to the gentleman that the Director of the Budget stated that this is a very essential commission or agency and that it has resulted in substantial savings. He was asked to supply for the record a list of the savings achieved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that list is to be found on page 180, and one of the heaviest expenditures from this fund in the past has been $207,721 for organization and management of the General Services Administration, and yet on page 181, where Mr. Stans submits the accomplishments, he neglects to say one word about the General Services Administration or any improvement in the management of the General Services Administration, among the so-called notable accomplishments that have accrued from this spending. Can the gentleman explain why?

Mr. ANDREWS. No; I cannot. I will say to the gentleman that the committee is not writing the budget request for this agency.

Mr. GROSS. That was by all odds the largest expenditure from this fund in the past, and yet it is not even mentioned. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman is probably aware that the General Services Administration is today and has been hiring consultants to tell them what to do about office space in the Federal Government.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the appropriation item of $10,255,500 for the Executive Office of the President, is this the highest amount ever appropriated for the White House?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think it is. I believe the gentleman from California will explain that item in his statement.

Mr. YATES. Is it higher than the amount appropriated for this office at the time Mr. Truman was President?

Mr. ANDREWS. It is my recollection that it is.

THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

An appropriation of $1,295,000 is included in this bill for the American Bat-

tle Monuments Commission. This is the amount requested in the budget, and an increase of $27,000 over the comparable amount for 1959. This appropriation finances all costs of operation and maintenance of the American military cemeteries and memorials located in foreign countries and two memorials erected by the Commission in the United States. Sixty-one installations in 11 foreign countries and the United States are involved.

The unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated for construction of memorials and cemeteries will be sufficient to complete the program. Average employment is decreasing, from 122 in 1958 to 85 in 1959 and to 31 in 1960. This decrease is partially offset by smaller increases in the operation and maintenance account, for an overall decrease of 42 in the American Battle Monuments Commission for 1960.

The committee has included new language beginning on page 6, line 13, which will permit the Commission to use a portion of the unobligated balance in the construction account for appropriate dedications of World Wars I and II memorials.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

The committee is recommending a direct appropriation of $408,000 for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, to be augmented by $50,000 from the war claims fund. Average employment will decline from 78 in the current fiscal year to 46 in 1960. The Commission is scheduled to complete its Soviet, Rumanian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Italian claims programs this summer. The major activity for fiscal year 1960 will be the comparatively small but technical Czechoslovakian program.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The bill includes $380,000 for the Subversive Activities Control Board. This is $20,000 less than requested in the budget, and an increase over 1959 of $5,000. This reduction is made possible by dismissal of one of the Board's cases since the budget was made up. The workload of the Board depends on the number of cases brought by the Attorney General or by organizations or individuals; the Board has no control over its own workload. The dismissal of this one case will result in less cost of travel and may make it possible for the Board to get along with one less hearing examiner.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee is recommending the continuation of several general provisions with no change from the present act. We have deleted the old section 208, which required the Bureau of the Budget to make an annual report to the Congress of operations under the Bureau's Circular A-45 which establishes a rent policy for quarters supplied to Federal personnel and sets forth certain procedures for the administration of rents and service charges for such quarters.

We have included a new provision in the bill, section 210, to eliminate annual agency reports under section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955. These reports were necessary to put section 1311 in effect and make it work, but have served their purpose and are no longer needed.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], has explained the items contained in this bill and I join with him and the other members of the committee in urging its approval.

This is, as you know, the smallest of all our appropriations bills.

I enjoyed the hearings and was especially pleased to welcome three new members to the minority, Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska; Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio; and Mr. MICHEL, of Illinois.

We were also fortunate in securing the services of James Burris as our staff assistant and who as a first termer did a fine job.

The chairman, Mr. ANDREWS, as usual was most courteous to all of us as were all the members of the majority side.

The bill comes to you with a unanimous report of the committee.

I believe that most of the questions asked by the members of the committee received forthright answer from the witnesses; and, especially do I appreciate the manner in which Mr. Stans and his associates in the Bureau of the Budget responded to all the questions, as record will show.

But as insignificant as this appropriation appears, and probably is, in respect to the billions of dollars handled in other subcommittees, there is one basic, fundamental item that to my mind is very important. I refer to the item that has to do with the work of the Subversive Activity Control Board.

I shall go into detail on the item a little later but will refer you to the hearings—pages 98 to 122, inclusive—which gives you a complete picture of the work that has been done by this Board and the obstacles that they have encountered.

The funds for the general Government matters bill for fiscal year 1960 as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is in the amount of $13,608,500. The Subcommittee on Appropriations granted the budget allowance in all instances except two—namely, the item of $250,000 for "Expenses of management improvement" which it disapproved in full and the Subversion Activities Control Board from a request of $400,000 to $380,000, or a cut of $20,000.

The committee therefore allowed $13,338,500 for all activities under the heading of "General Government Matters," which is an increase of $173,130 over fiscal 1959 and $986,130 over fiscal year 1958.

The increase in dollar requirements comes about in spite of continuing reductions in employment in the agencies included in this bill. As an example of the reductions in personnel which have been accomplished over the years, let me cite the case of the Bureau of the Budget. This Bureau has reduced its employment by approximately 100 positions in the last 8 years. If anything, its workload and the complex of the problems it must deal with have increased over that span of time. The agencies included in this appropriation bill are doing a difficult and most important job with an absolute minimum of personnel and operating expense.

As you know the agencies for which these appropriations are made are in the main in the Executive Office of the President which includes, of course, the compensation of the President, the White House Office, special projects, the Executive Mansion and grounds, the Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council, and the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization. These agencies were allowed a total of $10,255,500 which is $800,000 more than fiscal 1959.

Other funds requested in this appropriation is the usual $1 million for the Emergency Fund of the President—which was allowed in full—and "Expenses of management improvement" for $250,000 which the committee disallowed.

Therefore the funds allowed the President for his salary, Executive Offices and his Emergency Fund and his Expenses of Management Improvement are $11,255,500 out of a request of $11,505,500.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

There are three other agencies in this appropriations request, namely, the American Battle Monuments Commission for which $1,295,000 was asked and allowed; the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for which $408,000 was asked and granted; the Subversive Activities Control Board for which $400,000 was asked and $380,000 granted, a reduction of $20,000.

As heretofore stated the committee disallowed the $250,000 requested for the item "Expenses of management improvement."

The original appropriation for this item was in 1954 in a supplemental request for $500,000; in 1955 the second appropriation was made, via the Independent Offices Appropriation of that year; the third appropriation for this item was made in 1957 through the General Government Matters Appropriations Act.

Nothing was appropriated in the years 1956, 1958, or 1959.

Each appropriation was made available until expended.

Consequently there is expected to be an unobligated balance of $211,000 on June 30 of this fiscal year.

These funds are to enable the President to have studies conducted of the organization and operations of the executive branch and to develop and install improvements therein.

Since these appropriations were originated in 1954, 18 projects have been financed through authority of the Bureau of the Budget delegated by the President to that agency.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget testified that:

> A number of the projects have reached a point where accomplishments and savings, which are verified by the agencies concerned can be identified.

Some of the accomplishments have resulted in definitely identifiable dollar savings. Others have provided improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of Government agencies and have enhanced the capacity of executive officials to manage the programs for which they are responsible.

One of the accomplishments from one of the projects that have been completed is the recent reorganization of the Defense Mobilization and Civil Defense programs. The principal recommendation was that functions should be vested in the President which had been vested by statute in other officials of the executive branch and that a new agency should be established in the executive office of the President by the merger of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. This agency would assist the President in formulating policies and coordinating planning for nonmilitary defense functions.

In April of last year, 1958, the President transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 which became effective on July 1, 1958. This new consolidation and merger is now known as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Some savings have been affected by this consolidation but the long-run effect will be through reductions in expenditures made possible through the more effective carrying out of programs which had been insufficiently coordinated.

Five projects are currently underway and are expected to be completed in the near future.

Emphasis will be placed on those projects which will produce definite and identifiable savings or other concrete and measurable results.

Therefore, in view of the nature of this item it is not possible to indicate a specific program of matters that will be studied, specific allocations and agencies to which they may be made, or the manner in which particular studies will be conducted.

However, since the unobligated balance June 30 is expected to be $211,000 and an estimate of $161,000 is forecast for 1960 there would be a balance of $50,000 at the end of fiscal 1960 if no new money was provided for 1960.

In light of the benefits to be derived from the management improvement program there was some disagreement in the committee in denying the $250,000 requested for 1960.

Of course, if the $211,000 is insufficient then it would be necessary to come back for a supplemental.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

This Board made a request for $400,000. The committee allowed $380,000.

This Board was established by the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. It is composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice of the Senate.

Since 1951 the Board has received $2,619,905 in appropriations. With the granting of funds for fiscal 1960 they will have received practically $3 million to carry out the intent of the Subversive Activities Control Act.

The subcommittee is greatly concerned about the evident standstill that has resulted from the action of the Supreme Court in remanding the case to the Board on credibility questions involving Government witnesses, and in so doing, declined to pass on the constitutionality of the act.

As our report points out:

Pending final judicial determination on the basic question of constitutionality, the control board and the lower courts cannot proceed with other cases.

According to the information given us there have been 24 cases docketed from the inception of the Board to April 30, 1959.

Of these, nine have been dismissed, including the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, six on motion of the Attorney General, one dissolved by the State of New York, and two were dissolved before service.

Twelve cases were ordered to register as Communist front organizations. Eight of the cases are pending judicial review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Four cases were ordered by the Board in April of 1959 and have 60 days' time to file a petition for appellate court review.

Two cases are pending completion of hearings, and of course we have the case of the Communist Party versus the United States.

I should like to say a further word about the Subversive Activities Control Board. This Board serves in a quasi-judicial capacity in adjudicating cases brought before it under the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Board has no power to conduct investigations and initiate cases itself. The cases are brought by the Attorney General or by other organizations or individuals.

In its first case, that involving the Communist Party of the United States, the Board found that there exists a world Communist movement, substantially as described in the statute, organized and directed by a foreign government. The Board detailed the history of the Communist Party in the United States and its relation to the world Communist movement. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit affirmed the Board's order against the Communist Party and in so doing held that all pertinent sections of the statute were constitutional.

The Communist Party case has twice been sent back to the Board. The first was a remand by the Supreme Court resulting from challenges to the testimony of three Government witnesses. The second was a remand by the court of appeals requiring the production of documents in line with the principles of the then recent decision of the Supreme Court in Jencks against United States.

After the remand proceedings, the Board in both instances reaffirmed its determination as to the Communist Party. The report of the Board on the second remand was issued and sent to the court of appeals on February 9 of this year. Work in connection with supporting and defending the Board's order through the appellate process, including ultimate decision by the Supreme Court, will be an important item in the 1960 fiscal year activities. It is only after the Supreme Court affirms the constitutionality of the statute and affirms the Board's determination as to the Communist Party that the full force of the statute comes into play. In other words, the act isn't in full play really until the Supreme Court has passed on the principal case against the Communist Party, because all the front cases presuppose that that has been the ultimate finding.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of $380,000 to the Subversive Activities Control Board which is a reduction of $20,000 in the estimate. However, the Chairman of the Board in testimony before the committee indicated that this reduction was possible because of the dismissal of one of the major cases of the Board and that the remaining workload will be handled adequately with the reduced appropriation. The committee does not intend this action to restrict in any way the ability of the Board to carry out its responsibilities under the Subversive Activities Control Act and, in fact, is hopeful that the Supreme Court will take early action to rule on the question of constitutionality, thereby making it possible for the Internal Security Act to become effective.

From this history you can see how frustrating it must be—not only to the committee but to everybody concerned with this problem.

Until a decision is made by the Supreme Court so that the lower courts can act we will continue to have this problem of inaction.

In the meantime the Communists go merrily on with their dilatory tactics.

I believe that the Board has been doing a splendid job and I do not like to see it hampered.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT—NATIONAL DEFENSE

The committee allowed the full amount requested—$1 million.

These funds enable the President to provide for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense at his discretion.

Consequently there has been disbursed to date $885,000 of which $300,000 is to be paid back by the State Department when they receive their supplemental appropriations.

The projects for which this money was used were:

First, Department of Commerce—December 20, 1958—$60,000 to be used to make a study required by law—Public Law 85-880—of the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., in 1961.

Second, Department of Defense—December 23, 1958—to cover expenses of the President's committee—Draper Committee—to study the U.S. military assistance program, $400,000.

Third, Department of Commerce—January 15, 1959—to provide the Commerce Department with a staff of transportation experts to evaluate the Nation's transportation needs and problems, $100,000.

Fourth. Department of State—February 17, 1959—to defray costs of participation in international conferences. These were not budgeted in their regular bill, $100,000.

Fifth. Department of State—March 10, 1959—for the same purpose as the other, $200,000.

Sixth. To Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure—to investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view of achieving improvements, $25,000.

With the allocation of $885,000 it will leave a balance of $115,000. However, with the State Department receiving its supplemental it will repay the $300,000 utilized which will leave a balance of $415,000.

It is my opinion that this fund is being carefully administered after hearing all the testimony.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The American Battle Monuments Commission was granted the full amount of its request of $1,295,000 for salaries and expenses.

Since their appropriations are continued and the construction program is virtually completed they have not asked for any construction money.

This is the 11th year of a construction program of U.S. military cemeteries in foreign countries and memorials to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces in World War II at 15 locations in foreign countries. The program also includes memorials on the east and west coasts of the United States and in Hawaii.

The Commission estimates that the present program will be completed by April 1961, with all projects except the memorials in New York City and Hawaii to be completed by June 1960.

The estimated cost of construction has now been revised downward to about $35 million as against the original estimate of $39 million.

The unobligated funds for construction as of December 31, 1958 was $4,238,664. Out of this balance, in addition to completion of construction it is estimated that $160,000 could be appropriated and made available for necessary expenses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II memorials, and so forth, in July 1960, the beginning of fiscal 1961.

Gen. Thomas North, the Secretary, and Col. Charles B. Shaw and their staff are to be commended for the fine work they have done.

One of the outstanding features of this program, to my mind, is the picture and pamphlet of the cemetery and grave of their loved one to the next of kin.

Thus far the commission has had requests for 3,754 pictures, many of them for cemeteries which are to be photographed this year. They have been able to send out and furnish 2,102. Many beautiful letters of acknowledgment and appreciation have been received from grateful recipients.

These American military cemeteries and memorials represent an investment of more than $39 or $40 million by the United States. The cemetery sites have been carefully selected and magnificently developed; the memorials and instructive and decorative features have been thoughtfully conceived by outstanding American architects and artists and have been skillfully executed. These peaceful cemeteries and impressive memorials constitute most appropriate commemoration of those American service men and women who have given their lives in the cause of freedom, as well as of the achievements of the American Armed Forces. They are viewed each year by thousands of visitors, a great many of them Europeans and people from other continents. They make a highly important psychological contribution to the furtherance of our international ideals, recalling so vividly as they do that our countrymen have paid the price in lives as well as in treasure. Their standard of maintenance evokes unvaryingly favorable comment and appreciation of the high regard paid by our Government to the memory of those who died in the service of their country.

There is included in the bill a new proviso which will permit the Commission to expend, not to exceed $160,000 of the balance remaining in the construction fund for appropriate dedications. This proposal was not included in the original budget as submitted to the Congress but has been incorporated in this bill as the result of recent developments. The Commission and the President have recently agreed that arrangements should be made well in advance for the dedication of remaining oversea cemeteries in the summer of 1960. It will be important not to delay these dedications as construction will then have been completed; it will then have been 15 years since the end of the war; relatives are pressing the Commission for dates of dedication to permit them to make their plans; the lighting fixture presented by the Queen of Holland is being installed at Margarten and will be ready for the dedication ceremonies.

For these reasons the President has approved the Commission's proposal that $160,000 of the balance in the construction fund be allotted to expenses for dedications and the committee has concurred in this recommendation.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

This Commission was established by Presidential Order 10432 in January 1953, to advise him with respect to changes in the organization and activities of the executive branch of the Government which, in its opinion, would promote economy and efficiency in the operation of that branch.

Their request for $57,500 was granted in full.

During 1958 fiscal year, and so far during the current fiscal year, several major organizational actions were taken in which this Commission has taken part.

Some of the reorganizations are:

First. Reorganization of the Department of Defense.

Second. Establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, replacing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Third. Establishment of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, merging and replacing the former Office of Defense Mobilization and former Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Fourth. Establishment of the Federal Aviation Agency replacing the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Airways Modernization Board, and so forth.

The committee was assured by Dr. Flemming, the Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Reorganization, that there was no duplication whatever between the work of his committeee and that of the work being done in the item "Expenses of management improvement."

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The committee allowed the full budget estimate of $792,000 for the National Security Council—an increase of $32,600 over 1959 fiscal year.

This money takes care of structures under the National Security Council such as Council itself, the Operations Coordinating Board and the Planning Board.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The budget estimate of $395,000 was allowed by the committee.

The Council of Economic Advisers analyzes the national economy and its various segments; advises the President on economic developments; recommends policies for economic growth and stability; appraises economic programs and policies of the Federal Government; and assists in preparation of the annual report of the President to Congress.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

The budget estimate of $4,665,000 was granted in full by our subcommittee.

This is an increase of $76,000 over the 1959 appropriation of $4,051,970, and $384,000 will be proposed as a supplemental appropriation to meet pay act costs.

This amount of money will allow the Bureau to continue with the same amount of personnel and positions as the current year and would pay for the additional day in 1960 over and above the number of days which occur in fiscal 1959, together with the full-year costs in 1960 of grade promotions made in 1959 together with the related costs such as contribution to the retirement fund.

I believe it is significant to note that there are the same number of people working in the Bureau as of the current year and 99 less than 10 years ago.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission's estimate of $408,000 for direct appropriations in addition to $50,000 from the War Claims Fund was granted in full.

This is a reduction from the current year's appropriation of $244,300 of which 41,800 is attributable to reduced transfer from the War Claims Fund, and $202,500 represents a decrease from the general funds of the Treasury.

Beginning on page 88 of the hearings you will find an account of the history of this Commission, the claims completed and from which funds they were paid; the current claims progams and the Commission procedures.

Also the various bills pending before the Congress.

This information was given by Mr. Whitney Gillilland, Chairman of the Commission before a Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House on April 16, 1959, about 2 weeks before testifying before our committee.

Scheduled for completion August 9, 1959, are five programs of claims; namely:

First. Soviet.
Second. Rumanian.
Third. Hungarian.
Fourth. Bulgarian.
Fifth. Italian.

The major activity in fiscal 1960 will be the start of the Czechoslovakian claims program. The last date for filing is August 1, 1959.

Already, 3,800 requests for forms have been received and 712 claims have been filed for a total of approximately $30 million.

This program is scheduled for completion August 1, 1962.

A staff reduction of 46 is contemplated.

Then there is the probability of nationalization claims of Americans against Poland and war damage claims against Germany and Japan.

In my opinion Mr. Gillilland and his staff have done a good job over the years.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman with regard to section 202 of title 2 regarding which I spoke to him a few moments ago. That is the section which prohibits the use of any of the moneys appropriated herein for the payment of compensation to any employee of the Government other than a citizen of the United States with the four exceptions listed; and on page 9 one of the exceptions in line 5 is "or is an alien from the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence."

I understand the Department of Agriculture has a shortage of veterinarians and wish to employ a certain number of Polish officers who are citizens of Poland, but who are veterinarians. The phrase "or from Poland" was not put in the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE], was to offer an amendment to include the phrase "or from Poland", but I understand the amendment would not be germane.

I had the pleasure of discussing this matter with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, also the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. May I confirm the understanding that if such an amendment is offered in the Senate the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have no objection to its being included?

Mr. FENTON. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I appreciate the matter he speaks of, that he mentioned it to me just a moment or two before we began consideration of the bill. I have not had a chance to talk with the other members on my side of the committee. It has not been considered in the committee, and I just could not at this moment bind my fellow committee members. Personally I am not opposed to it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Pennsylvania discussed the matter of this language change with me. Should it be inserted during consideration of the bill in the Senate, as far as our side is concerned we would go along with it.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I thank both the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to page 6 of the report and ask if he would be kind enough to explain the reasons for the proposed changes in existing law as contained on page 13, line 10, of the pending bill and reading as follows:

> SEC. 210. (a) Section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C. 200 (b)) is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in connection with the submission of all requests for proposed appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obligations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as defined in subsection (a) hereof."

Mr. FENTON. I might say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that that refers to a change which was suggested to our subcommittee. As I understand, the committee inserted this language to eliminate the annual agency report. The gentlewoman will find an explanation on page 5.

Mrs. CHURCH. Do I understand that this will in no sense weaken the obligation of the Executive Branch to report?

Mr. FENTON. I understand it will not weaken it at all. This really gets rid of a duplication of effort. It will eliminate a lot of extra work for the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies concerned. You will notice the following statement on page 5:

> The proposition in the bill is to substitute for the present reports a simple report to the Budget Bureau, when submitting requests for appropriations, that statements of obligations furnished therewith consist of valid obligations in accord with definitions in subsection (a) of Section 1311.

All they have to do is verify that the statements sent are true.

Mrs. CHURCH. Will the same complete statements be sent?

Mr. FENTON. As I understand it, that is so.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take another minute on the Subversive Activities Control Board. This Board made a request for $400,000 and was allowed $380,0000.

The Board was established by the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. It is composed of five Members appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate.

Since 1951 the Board has received $2,619,905 in appropriations. With the granting of funds for fiscal 1960 they will have received practically $3 million to carry out the intent of the Subversive Activities Control Act.

The subcommittee is greatly concerned about the evident standstill that has resulted from action of the Supreme Court in remanding a case to the Board upon credibility questions involving Government witnesses and in so doing declining to pass on the constitutionality of the act.

Our report points out:

> Pending judicial determination of the basic question of constitutionality, the Control Board and the lower courts cannot proceed with other cases.

According to the information given us, there have been 24 cases docketed from the inception of the Board to April 30, 1959. Of these, 9 have been dismissed, including the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America; 6 were, on motion of the Attorney General, dissolved by the State of New York; 2 were dissolved before service, and 12 cases were ordered to register as Communist-front organizations.

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the members of the Committee of the Whole to information contained on pages 124 to 147 of the hearings. Set forth on those pages are tables showing the cost of the operation and the upkeep of the White House and the various staffs assigned to work at the White House Executive Offices during the past 20 years.

The committee has given to the President, as has been customary, the amount he asked for.

During the past year or so there have been any number of articles written in various magazines and questions put forth by columnists, some of which I have noted, which asked questions about or commented on the increases in staff for and expenditures by the White House. It is not the desire of the committee at this time to belabor this point or to make a great issue of it, at least not until it can be reviewed and studied in more detail by the committee. The figures brought out are extremely interesting, partially due, of course, to the increase in the cost of materials and services over that period.

I cannot help but comment that in the services provided the White House there are any number of services which do not show in the White House budget. There are boats supplied by the Navy which are not shown specifically anywhere, either in the Navy budget or in the White House budget. It is somewhere in a lump sum in the Navy budget. There are planes and helicopters supplied by the Air Force which do not show in the Air Force budget specifically, nor are they shown anywhere, or is there any reference to them in the White House budget or the budget request. It is somewhere in a lump sum for transportation for the White House.

There are automobiles which do not show, there are individuals whose services are used, such as crews to man boats and men to man the planes, and mess attendants at the White House. All of these figures should be compiled and shown in the information supplied to the Congress by way of this committee. The Congress and the American public certainly should know every cent that goes directly or indirectly to the support of the White House, its maintenance, repair, travel funds, and repair and upkeep and manning of vehicles, staff and consultants, and all of the special funds in other appropriations used by the White House.

The figures produced by the Reference Section of the Library of Congress gave the committee a basis upon which to ask certain questions of the Director of the Bureau of the Burget who appeared on behalf of the White House to make the presentation on their request. He was asked to review these figures and submit his tables. Both tables are set forth in the hearings for the first time for the use and information of the general public to the extent that we were able to adduce them at that time. And, I am sure that the committee next year will want to go further into this matter and develop some of these figures that do not show anything in these specific budgets. I call that to your attention simply to point out that the cost of government is increasing just as much at the White House as people say it is increasing in other fields of government.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, it is with real pleasure that I rise today to support passage of H.R. 7176 without amendment. Known as the general Government matters bill, this provides funds for the Executive Office of the President, as well as for a few other independent agencies.

First of all, let me say that my service on the subcommittee handling H.R. 7176 has been a most pleasureable one. The committee chairman, the Honorable GEORGE ANDREWS, of Alabama, has served capablly and well and with complete fairness to all members of the committee whether in the majority or minority. I consider myself fortunate, indeed, to have worked under his leadership.

The bill was thoroughly discussed in committee. Every item was pored over by committee members and the staff. We feel that we have come up with a good bill, one which provides an adequate amount of money for the various offices concerned, and one which provides at the same time a considerable saving, in percentages, to the taxpayers.

As is noted in the report accompanying H.R. 7176, we have made several reductions from the budget estimates. These reductions were made with some hesitation and only after careful study. The principal reduction was in funds for the Battle Monument Commission and the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, both of whose workload is fast diminishing.

Additionally, we trimmed some $250,000 from the budgetary requests made by the Executive for the operation of these offices. This money came from requests for management improvement surveying. It is not that the committee felt this is not a worthwhile project, but rather because we found that the Executive Office already had sufficient funds in a carry-over status available for this project.

Witnesses appearing before the committee could not justify additional funds of this kind in view of the carry-over.

The total for this bill is $13,338,500, an increase of $173,130 over the 1959 fiscal year figure. This is a reduction of $270,000 from the President's requests. I have already outlined the areas in which cuts were made.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House one other item which, although it does not appear in this bill, is still of considerable interest to the taxpaying public. This involves the methods selected for guarding certain sections of the Executive Office Building. The National Security Council area of this building is guarded by the General Services Administration—and its costs are contained in that appropriations bill. However, another small portion of the building is guarded by personnel hired for that purpose by the White House Police Force and are part of that contingent. It seemed odd to the committee that it would be necessary to guard one portion of the building with men hired by one agency, and other part of the same building by men hired by another agency and wearing different uniforms. The discrepancy becomes particularly apparent when we discover that there are no more secret or confidential papers contained in the one section than in the other.

In closing I would like to ask for wholehearted support for this bill. I think it has been cut where cuts were found to be necessary by the committee. I do not think further cuts would be justified, nor do I think any of the figures contained in the bill should be increased.

I urge its passage.

COMPARATIVE COST DATA ON THE PRESIDENCY AND FUNCTIONS RELATING THERETO, FISCAL YEARS 1938–60

(Prepared by the Library of Congress)

The data relating to Executive Office of the President in the tables showing appropriations and number of positions was secured from annual budget documents and appear to be accurate. However, there are a number of points about the report which should be considered.

We believe comparisons of 1960 estimated appropriations and number of positions with those for 1938 are of doubtful value. The problems faced by the Federal Government today are of such greater magnitude that comparison of the Executive Office of the President of today with that of 1938 is of little more than academic interest unless the reasons for the change in the Executive Office are also analyzed. Population increases, the tremendous advances in science, threats to our security, and the greatly increased role of the United States in world affairs, are a few of the changes since 1938 which necessarily make the role of the Federal Government, and the Executive Office of the President, radically different from what it was in 1938. Changes of this nature account in large measure for increases in White House staff and White House Police, as well as for the addition of other units to the Executive Office of the President.

There is another possible reason why White House office appropriations and personnel have increased substantially since 1938. Although we are unable to document it, veteran Bureau of the Budget employees state that until 1947 the White House secured a large proportion of its staff by detail from other agencies. These employees were paid from appropriations to the agencies providing the personnel to the White House. The substantial increase in the White House appropriation for 1947 over 1946, from $342,588 to $883,660, and in number of positions, from 52 to 210, would appear to support statements that large details of personnel to the White House had previously been the practice. Appropriation hearings and committee reports are silent as to the reason for the increase in 1947.

The report also notes that personal service cost for the White House office has increased 16 times and for the White House Police 7 times since 1938, without mentioning the substantial salary increases that have occurred. The fact that White House office personnel have increased only six times and White House Police personnel only two and eight-tenths times is a measure of the effect which salary increases have had in increasing appropriations. Using data on tables 2, 3, 5, and 6 of the Library of Congress report, average salary for 1938, 1952, and 1960 has been computed for White House Office and Executive Mansion and Grounds by dividing number of positions into personal services cost. From these average salaries we obtain percentage increases in average salary, 1960 compared to 1938 and 1952, as follows:

	Average salary			Percent increase	
	1938	1952	1960	1960 over 1938	1960 over 1952
White House office	$3,206	$5,541	$7,166	123	29
Executive Mansion and Grounds	1,844	3,570	5,036	173	41

On page 4 of the report, there is a table showing appropriations and number of positions for 1938, 1952, and 1960 for compensation of the President, White House office, Execution Mansion and grounds, and White House Police. Included in the White House office total for 1960 is the special projects appropriation. These are described as funds appropriated for the immediate support of the President and his staff.

It is our view that a comparison based on total Executive Office of the President appropriations and personnel provides a better measure of increases or decreases in presidential staff than does a comparison using only certain portions of the Executive office. Each President tends to organize and use the Executive Office somewhat differently so that comparisons of appropriations and personnel have some validity only if comparisons take into account the total Executive Office. However, we believe that it is appropriate to exclude from this comparison the Federal Civil Defense Administration, which is now a part of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, but in 1952 was a separate agency outside of the Executive Office.

Attached is a table prepared on a total Executive Office basis, comparing 1938, 1952, and 1960. The figures used are those contained in the Library of Congress report,

except for the addition of two accounts, the emergency fund for the President and the President's Committee on Fund Raising in the Federal service. This table indicates that the number of positions in the Executive Office, excluding the recently added Federal Civil Defense Administration positions, has declined by 96 since 1952.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Appropriations and number of personnel, fiscal years 1938, 1952, and 1960

	1938		1952		1960 (estimate)	
	Appropriations	Number of positions	Appropriations	Number of positions	Appropriations	Number of positions
Compensation of the President	$75,000	1	$150,000	1	$150,000	1
White House office	211,380	45	1,883,615	261	2,221,000	272
Executive Mansion and grounds	210,098	57	335,600	71	475,000	72
White House Police	150,650	60	652,000	170	1,055,000	170
Bureau of the Budget	220,000	45	3,608,000	515	4,665,000	435
Council of Economic Advisers			341,800	47	395,000	31
Emergency fund for the President			5,580,100	[1] 82	1,000,000	[1] 5
National Security Council			160,000	23	792,000	77
National Security Resources Board			1,627,000	135		
Office of Defense Mobilization			1,711,250	199		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization					86,970,000	1,768
Special projects					1,500,000	101
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization					57,500	5
President's Committee on Fund Raising in the Federal Service					49,000	4
Total	867,128	208	16,049,365	1,504	99,329,500	2,941
Deduct: Civil defense activities					−84,685,000	[2] −1,533
Total, adjusted for comparability	867,128	208	16,049,365	1,504	14,644,500	1,408

[1] Represents average number of personnel on a full-year basis; number of positions not available.
[2] It is estimated that 235 positions and $2,285,000, the amount of the 1959 Office of Defense Mobilization appropriation, are applied to functions of the former Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

(Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, in 1950 the Congress of the United States passed the Internal Security Act of 1950. Section 2 of the act set out the reasons for its enactment. I shall just read you very briefly one of the reasons which, to my mind, is paramount and sufficient:

The Communist organization in the United States, pursuing its stated objectives, the recent successes of Communist methods in other countries, and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself, present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such worldwide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

That is the purpose of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as declared by the Congress of the United States. The act required the registration of Communist organizations under certain circumstances. It required the registration of members of a Communist organization under certain circumstances. It then created the Subversive Activities Control Board to determine when those circumstances had been established and when there should be registration. The operation of that Board has cost the people of the United States approximately $400,000 a year. The appropriation for the Board in this bill is $380,000.

Now, to tell you just what happened, I shall not use my own language, but I shall quote a Justice of the Supreme Court. I shall read to you from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Clark, with whom Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton concurred, in the case of Communist Party of the United States of America, petitioner, against Subversive Activities Control Board. Mr. Clark said:

On November 22, 1950, the Attorney General petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board for an order directing the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization, pursuant to the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. On April 20, 1953, the Board unanimously directed the Communist Party to register, finding "upon the overwhelming weight of the evidence, * * * [the Communist Party] is substantially directed, dominated, and controlled by the Soviet Union * * * and * * * operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement."

Nearly 2 years later, while the matter was before the Court of Appeals, the Communist Party filed a motion for leave to adduce additional evidence under section 14 (a) of the Internal Security Act.

The "new evidence" attacked the credibility of witnesses Crouch, Johnson, and Matusow, 3 of the 22 witnesses for the Government. The motion charged that Crouch and Johnson had perjured themselves in their testimony in such other cases as *United States* v. *Kuzma*, *United States* v. *Bridges*, *In re Bruck*, and *United States* v. *Weinberg*. It also charged that Matusow had recanted his testimony in Communist cases and was writing a book entitled "Blacklisting (or Blackmailing) Was My Business."

The Board opposed the motion, stating that the testimony of the three witnesses could "be ignored in toto and the ultimate determination * * * will remain amply supported by evidence both testimonial and documentary in character * * *. The [Communist Party] would still be found a Communist action organization by overwhelming evidence."

The Court of Appeals denied the motion without opinion.

* * * * *

The Communist Party brought the case here on April 13, 1955, by petition for certiorari. The relative unimportance of this motion in the eyes of the party is shown by the fact that its 131-page petition devotes but 2 pages to a discussion of this point. The party's brief devotes only 4½ of its 270 pages to the motion. Still the Court now says the Court of Appeals "erred" in its denial of the motion and remands the case directly to the Board for it to determine again the credibility of these three witnesses. It refused to pass on the important questions relating to the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950, a bulwark of the congressional program to combat the menace of world communism. Believing that the Court here disregards its plain responsibility and duty to decide these important constitutional questions, I cannot join in its action.

Then again the decision continues:

I abhor the use of perjured testimony as much as anyone, but we must recognize that never before have mere allegations of perjury, so flimsily supported, been considered grounds for reopening a proceeding or granting a new trial. The Communist Party makes no claim that the Government knowingly used false testimony, and it is far too realistic to contend that the Board's action will be any different on remand. The only purpose of this procedural maneuver is to gain additional time before the order to register can become effective. This proceeding has dragged out for many years now, and the function of the Board remains suspended and the congressional purpose frustrated at a most critical time in world history.

Ironically enough, we are returning the case to a Board whose very existence is challenged on constitutional grounds. We are asking the Board to pass on the credibility of witnesses after we have refused to say whether it has the power to do so. The constitutional questions are fairly presented here for our decision. If all or any part of the act is unconstitutional it should be declared so on the record before us. If not, the Nation is entitled to effective operation of the statute deemed to be of vital importance to its well being at the time it was passed by the Congress. I would decide the questions presented by this record.

That was the statement of the minority decision of the Supreme Court. What happened? The case was remanded to the Board which expunged the testimony of the three witnesses and redecided the case. It was again appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals. While pending decision there the Supreme Court decided the case of Jencks against United States. In accordance with this decision the Circuit Court of Appeals again remanded the case to the Board. The Board has now decided it for the third time, and it is again on its way back to the Supreme Court and a decision is hoped for in 1960, 10 years after the passage of the law.

What has been the effect of this decision? Let me read you from the testimony adduced before our committee. Mrs. Dorothy McCullough Lee is the Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. On page 118 of the testimony is this question:

Mr. GARY. Mrs. Lee, I understand that because of the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court you are now operating in an atmosphere of uncertainty, suspension, and hopelessness. Is that correct?

Mrs. LEE. Sir, I would say that ever since I have been on the Board—and I went in on September 1956—it has been an atmosphere of uncertainty, but as far as I am concerned

I have never felt any hopelessness about it. It seems to me that the purpose behind the Internal Security Act of 1950 as it affects this Board, the purpose of Congress was a very effective one; the purpose or revelation; the purpose of registration in the war against internal communism.

Mr. Chairman, then I said, "Unless the act is declared constitutional your work is hopeless." And she said, "It is difficult to anticipate that decision."

Then I said, "Let us say then confusion and frustration."

She admitted, "I would not say there was no frustration, sir."

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a clipping from yesterday's paper in which it says that two additional sources warn against the Communist activities in the United States.

Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Committee, released a documented staff study Saturday saying the Comintern has been revitalized as the "Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties."

Another warning of the Communist threat came from FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who said:

Communists in the United States have renewed their drive to form a new youth group and to infiltrate basic American industries.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain the only conclusion that can be drawn from this record is that the Supreme Court of the United States fiddles, and the Subversive Activities Control Board cools its heels while America burns.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in this bill in that the President did not set the example of cutting back rather than calling for increased expenditures for the White House as compared to a year ago. Certainly this appropriation bill is less than the budget estimates, but it is an increase over the moneys appropriated for this purpose a year ago. I am disappointed that the President of the United States did not set the example of cutting back expenditures in his own shop.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman realizes, of course, that many of these increases are due to increases in salaries.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I will say to the gentleman that the White House staff, it seems to me on the basis of the evidence adduced at your hearings could very well have cut back on some of the personnel employed over there to take care of the salary increases, with something to spare.

Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Am I correct in that $400,000 was taken from the President's emergency fund to finance the so-called Draper report?

Mr. ANDREWS. Approximately that amount.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. And if you will read the report, you will note that the committee raised the question as to whether or not the fact was that there was an emergency within the meaning of the law. But, after all, the President is the sole judge of what that money is to be spent for and how it shall be spent.

Mr. GROSS. I will only say to the gentleman that I have a couple of amendments when we come to the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, and I will go into that further at that time.

Now I do want to call attention to the Council of Economic Advisers. I believe that there is $395,000 appropriated for the Council of Economic Advisers in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS. It is $393,000.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is $393,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers with three members of the council being paid $20,000 per year and according to your hearings, it is probably one of the highest paid outfits in the Government man for man and person for person, and yet we find on the White House staff in addition to the Council of Economic Advisers, two or three more economists. Now, how in the world can you justify the maintenance of a Council of Economics Advisers, reporting directly to the President, three of whom are paid $20,000 a year, and still have two or three economists on the White House staff. I just do not understand it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman made a point of the increase in salaries for the Council of Economic Advisers which the President has had over a number of years. Some of these increases certainly emanated from the executive pay raise bill which was approved and authorized by the gentleman's own Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that the President with three $20,000 a year men, plus 11 economists on top of the 3 top people, plus the hire of consultants, is rather excessive? Does not the gentleman feel the President could well dispense with the economists on his staff?

Mr. MICHEL. I think the council of economic advisers serves a very useful purpose. I believe the President should be counselled in this regard and that he has need for them.

Mr. GROSS. There is no question but what he needs economic advisers, but does not the gentleman think that somewhere down the line on this item the President could effect some economies?

Mr. MICHEL. The President has effected economies. If the gentleman will yield further I would like to point out to him that there are as a matter of fact fewer employees at the White House now than there were back in 1953 when he assumed the office.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot argue with that, but at that time we did not have a $288 billion public debt.

I just happen to think that with this huge staff of economic advisers the President does not need others on his personal staff probably drawing $20,000 or $22,000 a year.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. It was not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to take the time of the Members of the House during general debate on this bill, for I thought the committee was in pretty unanimous agreement. I do, however, want to point out some very significant figures that I think have a place in this debate. As I pointed out to the gentleman from Iowa there has been an increase in the average salary of White House personnel from an average of $5,441 in 1952 to an average of $7,166 in the projected year 1960. This comes about as the result of some of the actions we have taken here on the floor of this House of Representatives in raising salaries of civil service employees generally.

Then when you take into consideration the Executive Mansion and the grounds, and the increase in salaries that must pe paid to the employees tending the mansion and grounds, there has been an increase from an average of $3,570 in 1952 to an average of $5,036 in the fiscal year 1960.

However, the number of employees at the White House has actually decreased from 1,504 in 1952 to a total of 1,408 in the fiscal year 1960.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. WEAVER. Will the gentleman kindly tell us the source of the information he is using for the year 1960 and the year 1952?

Mr. MICHEL. My source is the Library of Congress as shown in the hearings on this bill, page 138 of the printed hearings.

I would like to remind the Members of this House that we are experiencing the same thing right here in the House of Representatives in the care and upkeep of the Capitol grounds and in the increases in the salaries of the employees here. Do you gentlemen realize that the Congress had as of January 31, 1959, 1,081 more employees than on June 30, 1954?

In 1953 it cost something like $23 million for the operation of the House of Representatives; in 1958 it cost us something like $39 million. This reflects the increased cost of government. If not only affects the White House but also affects use here in the Congress.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Referring to the question raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] with regard to economists, I wonder if the gentleman will agree that the end result of the employment of these economists actually reflects a savings of billions of dollars in our continuing fight against inflation.

Mr. MICHEL. I would certainly agree with the gentleman 100 percent. As a matter of fact, on the subject of management improvement again, while some of the remunerative benefits are not shown

in black and white, in dollars and cents values, it is good business practice. Private industry realizes the savings that can be effected by the retaining of good management counselors.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the appropriations requested for the administration of the White House have increased each year since 1953.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes; I believe in a general sense it has increased slightly up to the point I mentioned for today. But I would remind my friend that if he would care to go back 15 or 20 years he would find a steady increase of much greater proportions through the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ililinois if it is not a fact that there has been a yearly increase in the White House budget, and yet every year they have come in for supplemental appropriations?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes; but I do not know that there has been an increase every year, certainly in some years it has been more than others, but the same thing is true in the case of every agency of the Government, they have come in for supplemental appropriations also. I will say this last one was due to the salary increases which the Congress itself authorized.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Does not the gentleman feel this is a rather poor example of economy? Should we not have a better example from the White House?

Mr. MICHEL. I would simply say to the gentleman that I think the White House has done much better than we have done right here on the Hill.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, established by Executive Order 10432 of January 24, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $57,500.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, strike out all of lines 9 through 17.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply to get rid of what I consider a perfectly useless setup in the White House. I refer to page 9 of the hearings where Mr. ANDREWS, chairman of the subcommittee, tried hard to find some reason for the continuance of this particular group. He could not.

Let me read to you some of the testimony given before the committee. This is Mr. ANDREWS addressing his questions to Mr. Flemming, who apparently is Chairman of this President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization:

Mr. ANDREWS. Could you give us some opinions as to how much, if anything, has been saved the taxpayers by the operation of this Committee?

Mr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, I could not.

Mr. ANDREWS. You stated that one of your major actions was in connection with the reorganization of the Department of Defense. Do you think it has been reorganized in such a way that savings have accrued to the taxpayers?

Mr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, I would not make that allegation. I do not think it is possible to support a statement one way or the other regarding it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Could you give an example of one instance like that?

Mr. FLEMMING. I do not think I could offhand.

Nowhere in the testimony given before the subcommittee is there any real substantiation for the need or necessity for this so-called advisory group or of any substantial contribution that it has made to governmental reorganization.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to belabor the issue. I just think this is an excellent place to save $57,500; therefore I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Chairman, this advisory committee was requested by the President himself, and I would say that its continuance, as stated by Mr. Flemming, in our hearings would depend entirely on whether or not a President of the United States felt that such a committee would be of help to him in considering the various reorganization matters he is called upon to consider. The President apparently feels that he has a need for this committee. He has felt it has been helpful to him. Another President may not think the same way and that would be his privilege.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would hamper the President and is not altogether in conformity with the real reasons this committee was created.

I therefore ask the Committee of the Whole to reject the amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. This is one of the very few agencies which has not requested an increase in appropriations over what we allowed them for fiscal 1959?

Mr. FENTON. That is right.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WEAVER. Is it not true Mr. Flemming and his agency also was the only agency within the appropriation under consideration that reduced the number of its employees?

Mr. FENTON. Yes.

Mr. WEAVER. It was only by one, but that is very important.

Mr. FENTON. That is right.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I oppose my very warm friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], particularly when he is trying to strike out expenditures of the Government. At the same time, I think it ought to be borne in mind in this instance that this is the committee which was headed by Mr. Rockefeller up until the time he resigned to run for governor of the State of New York. The duty of this committee is to advise the President on Government organization or really reorganization. We have frequently had reorganization of the Government in the past. Some of it, I think, has been very helpful. I am not certain that all of it has. But, to keep our Government modern it is necessary for someone to constantly be on the alert to watch opportunities to consolidate agencies, to consolidate activities, and to bring about changes in the organization of the Government which will promote efficiency of administration and economy in the handling of governmental activities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether Dr. Flemming has used any of the funds of this advisory committee in the past or whether he will in the future to promote the career executive service, the elite corps in Government that he would like to put over? Would that be one of his organizations?

Mr. GRAY. If so, I will join the gentleman in trying to block it when it comes to the floor of the House. But, Dr. Flemming has succeeded Mr. Rockefeller as the chairman of this committee, and I assume that the funds of this committee will be used only for purposes of inquiring into proper reorganization of Government and to advising the President as to what changes he can make to promote the efficient and economical administration of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 15, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Emergency fund for the President, national defense

For expenses necessary to enable the President, through such officers or agencies of the Government as he may designate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home

or abroad during the current fiscal year, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Eighty-Sixth Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 4, line 23, after "designate" strike out "and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for some accountability with respect to the President's emergency fund. It seems to me that all public spending should be vouchered and accounted for. I seek by this very simple amendment to provide for a report after the funds have been used by the President, a report that can be vouchered or accounted for, so that the Congress and the public can know just exactly how these funds were spent. I think the President should have the broadest kind of discretion for spending these funds, for whatever emergency he deems necessary, but I think that the taxpayers are entitled to know how these funds have been used.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Would the gentleman be enthusiastic about having the Congress make a report on its use of the funds it uses abroad?

Mr. VANIK. Oh, I have no objection to that. I think they should be fully reported.

Mrs. BOLTON. A bill has been introduced for that purpose.

Mr. VANIK. I will be pleased to support that kind of legislation.

Mrs. BOLTON. Counterpart funds is what I am speaking of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the law for years and years and years that the President have an emergency fund. If you will turn to page 174 of the hearings, you will find that Mr. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, stated that the President has the exclusive right to use this money in any way he deems necessary. I quote from our hearings:

The purpose is to provide the President with a fund which can be used in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I think every Governor in each of our 50 States has an emergency fund, in most cases smaller than that allowed the President. Certainly the President of the United States needs an emergency fund, and he and he alone should determine when and for what purposes and in what amount funds should be expended from that emergency fund.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I have no argument with anything the gentleman has said. I concur and said in my statement that I agreed that the President should have this fund, and I agree that he should have the discretion to spend the money in any way he sees fit, and perhaps the fund ought to be more than is provided in the bill. But I think there ought to be an accounting after the fund has been spent.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is an accounting every year when the committee asks for what purposes the fund has been spent, and the gentleman can find that in the hearings. We may question whether or not the matter for which it was spent was an emergency, but nevertheless it is his emergency fund, to be spent as he sees fit. I think our hearings every year will show that we go into detail to ascertain how those funds are spent.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Do I understand that the President has never declined to advise the committee the purposes for which these funds were used?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. I had the impression that that has not always been true.

Mr. ANDREWS. As long as I have been on the committee the administration has never failed to give us the amounts that have been spent and the purposes for which the money was spent.

Mr. HARDY. Certainly, insofar as the law goes, he could not be required to do so under the language, is not that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think that is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Is it not true, particularly during time of war or even now during a time of the cold war, that there are occasions which arise when the President draws upon that emergency fund for any number of purposes about which we properly cannot talk on the floor of this House. But gentlemen who know what it takes to win a war effort, or a psychological battle, know it is absolutely necessary to have that discretionary authority.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I just wonder if Washington could operate without a cold war.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I subscribe to the idea that the President needs this fund, and he should have complete discretion how he uses it. But I do not subscribe to the notion that he should not be amenable to a suggestion that he tell the Congress, or at least the committee, what he has done with the fund, and certainly there would be times, I agree, when it should not be made public.

Mr. ANDREWS. He does; he tells the committee. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget tells our committee.

Mr. HARDY. If it is clear that there is no effort to hide from the committee the purposes for which the fund is used, I would have no objection to it. But there are so many things that are done under this guise to prevent the Congress from even finding out.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that there has never been any effort to conceal the expenditure of these funds from the committee or from the Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. There may be instances when it would not be advisable to publicize certain expenditures, but they are always available to the congressional committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right. And if you will look at page 166 of the hearings you will find listed the purposes for which the funds were expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment that would preclude the committee from ascertaining what the funds have been expended for; is there?

Mr. ANDREWS. No; there is not.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted upon.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As the chairman of our subcommittee has so well stated, this is a fund that has always been granted the President. There is certainly nothing concealed in the way he handles the money. I remember, I think it was 2 years ago, they asked for a $5 million appropriation for this item and the Congress sustained the committee in reducing it to $1 million. One million dollars has been the amount that has been given the President, not only this President, but Presidents down the line ever since I have been a member of this committee. I see no reason to change it at this time.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take just a minute to point out that contained in last year's appropriation bill for this purpose there was this provision:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or

agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

The effect of the language in the item containing the appropriation is to nullify this provision. Why nullify it in the case of the President? In a minute or two, I will offer an amendment and show you where that section of the law needs to be in this bill to stop the White House from using funds for propaganda purposes. The amendment ought to be adopted. It validates the provision found on page 13 of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. It makes one wonder where the funds came from to finance Eric Johnston's drive in our trade relations fight of last year.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. BAILEY. He was put on the staff of the White House, but what fund was he paid from?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, the gentleman from West Virginia is suggesting that the President used money from the emergency fund to finance that particular thing, but that is not true and I think the record should be kept straight on it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, the record will show that people employed by the White House and paid by White House funds were in that organization and helped to sponsor the propaganda meeting to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think the record is abundantly clear because Mr. Eric Johnston admitted that he received certain funds from the White House to finance the propaganda campaign and I can give you the amount and I will be very happy to insert the letter in the RECORD from Eric Johnston.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 5, June 4, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$600,000."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members to turn to page 167 of the hearings. There you will find some very enlightening information. At that point, Mr. ANDREWS, chairman of the subcommittee, asked Mr. Stans, the Director of the Budget, whether there was an allocation of $400,000 from the 1959 appropriation from the President's emergency fund to study the mutual assistance program—in other words, the foreign give-away program—and whether that represented the first time that funds were allocated for this purpose. The record is as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS. You have told us this fund is intended to enable the President to deal swiftly with sudden emergencies. What was so sudden about this study? What was the emergency?

Mr. STANS. I would say there are several factors that initiated the study.

Now listen to this, and this is Mr. Stans speaking:

Another factor, I am sure, was that the President has, from time to time, found the Congress somewhat unconvinced of the urgency and necessity of appropriations for various phases of the mutual security program.

In other words, last December the foreign give-away program was falling into disrepute and so it was decided by someone in the White House, perhaps by the President, that they had better get Mr. Draper and get another propaganda job done on the American people and on the Congress—that is what he is saying. Let me repeat what he said:

I am sure, the President has, from time to time, found the Congress somewhat unconvinced of the urgency and necessity of appropriations for various phases of the mutual security program.

Then Mr. Andrews said:

Why did this money come from the President's emergency fund rather than the mutual security fund?

Mr. Stans said:

Mr. Staats will answer that question.

And I believe Mr. Staats is Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Staats says:

I think it would be helpful if we could supply a more complete statement for the record. The original intention was to use those funds, but when the situation was examined it was found that there was a technicality in the law which made it unavailable to meet this kind of a situation.

All right, now, let us see what kind of a technicality, as Mr. Staats is pleased to call it—let us see what kind of technicality existed that they could not use mutual security funds to do a propaganda snow job on the American people and upon the Congress. I refer you to Public Law 85-853, the Mutual Security Appropriations bill, 85th Congress of August 28, 1958, page 2, section 102, which reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

Is that a technicality or is it the law? That is the reason why they had to resort to the emergency fund of the President for the $400,000. It was because of the language contained in the Mutual Security bill that funds contained therein could not be used for propaganda purposes. So the President employs Mr. Draper and the Draper Committee is born with a fund of $400,000. I do not believe there is anyone in the Congress who has seen the report of the Draper Committee. I understand a preliminary report has been made but I cannot get a copy of the full report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Speaking of technicalities the gentleman might mention also that a section of the Criminal Code which was read to the House only last week in debate on the housing bill makes it a criminal offense for members in the Executive Department overtly to lobby for or against legislation in the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Now, why this expenditure of $400,000 from the President's emergency fund? I picked up in my office this morning just a few of the publications that have been put out by the State Department and others for propagandizing the American public and the Congress on this foreign-giveaway program.

Here is a document about 4 inches thick put out by the other body in July 1957, which is 99.9 percent propaganda for the foreign-giveway program. Read it sometime. It cost a small fortune.

Here is a report to the President by the President's Citizens Advisers on Military Security Program, March 1, 1957, another propaganda piece.

Here is one, the mutual security program for fiscal year 1960, a summary presentation. Take a look at this if you want to see a nice, three-color job. If you can find anything here that is in any way critical of the foreign-aid program, I will eat the paper it is printed on.

Here is another put out as late as February 1959. If you can find anything in any way critical of the foreign-giveaway program, I will eat the paper it is printed on.

And yet the President has to have his so-called emergency fund to set up the Draper Committee to do still another propaganda job on the American people. All my amendment seeks to do is just to take out the $400,000 which he obviously did not need for emergency purposes. Let us see how much more propaganda he can buy for $600,000.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to page 139 of the hearings where he will find a table toward the bottom of the page and in that table an item which refers to the President's Committee on Fund Raising in the Federal Service, and provides $49,000. I would like to have the gentleman express his view on that particular committee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know anything about that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in rising in opposition to the amendment, I want to agree with

my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and I want to show him that the committee absolutely agrees with what he says. In order to do so, I am going to read from the report of the committee. The report contains the following statement:

The committee continues to support the proposition that the President should have available such a fund from which he may, in his discretion, provide for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense. However, this fund has been used with some frequency to initiate projects, committees, and agencies which lend themselves to perpetuation long beyond defensible pretext of emergency.

Witnesses speaking in behalf of this fund enumerated several studies, conducted under recent appropriations, which do not appear to meet the criteria justified by the administration and approved by the Congress. A case in point is a recent study of the mutual security program which has been presented to the Congress annually for more than a decade and given the most thorough consideration by a major legislative committee and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where the gentleman and I differ is he seems willing to go ahead and provide the money. I am not.

Mr. GARY. I am not willing to give them the money for another survey of that kind, but I am willing to give them the money for a national emergency. I do not believe that a million dollars is too much for the President to have as an emergency fund. He may not use it all, and I hope he will not; but if an emergency arises, and one may arise in which he might need every penny of the million dollars, I would not like to be faced with the fact that our committee or the Congress of the United States had withheld from him sufficient funds with which to handle the emergency.

Mr. GROSS. What is the gentleman going to do if again the President takes $400,000 to do another propaganda job on the Congress and the American people?

Mr. GARY. The President has his responsibility to the people of the United States just as this Congress does. I think we have got to trust somebody in the administration of the affairs of this Government. When we get to the point that we cannot trust the President of the United States with the expenditure of a million dollars, then I think we had better get another President.

Mr. GROSS. Regardless of whether we trust him or not, does the gentleman agree that he was right in spending $400,000 for the purpose for which it was expended?

Mr. GARY. I do not, and neither does our committee, and we have said so in no uncertain terms in our report. The President may not agree with us. I do not agree with everything the President does, and I am sure the President does not agree with everything we do, but, after all, the legislative and executive branches do have equal responsibility in the operation of the Government.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. In reference to this emergency allocation, I have looked over last year's appropriation, and there were appropriations for a number of things, including a transportation survey. What relationship do these things have to national security?

Mr. GARY. I think some expenditures have been made from this fund which were not in keeping with the intention of the Congress. I have stated that very frankly.

Mr. VANIK. In going through the explained expenditures, I am unable to strike a balance between what was explained and what was not explained. So I am somewhat concerned about the unexplained portion.

Mr. GARY. There was an explanation of all of the expenditures. The committee thought that some of them were not in conformity with the intent of the Congress; nevertheless, the committee expressed its opinion in the report and we hope that will deter expenditures of that kind in the future. However, we did not feel there was any justification for cutting out the fund.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this merely to make an inquiry. Did the committee consider language which would make applicable section 209 to this particular appropriation?

Mr. GARY. It did not.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, everybody seems to be agreed that there should be some means to prevent the improper use of this fund for purposes prohibited under section 209.

Mr. GARY. There is not any question about the fact that the emergency appropriation is subject to 209. It is in the same bill.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not true that previously these funds have been used for such purposes in contravention of similar language?

Mr. GARY. That may be a question of opinion. In the opinion of the committee, they were.

Mr. HARDY. Does the President disagree with the opinion of the committee on this?

Mr. GARY. We have submitted our report and we have not heard from the President on the report.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman must know that inclusion in the report of language which the President did not choose to follow would not be as binding as language in the bill itself; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is unquestionably correct. But when you begin to define what is in the national interest, you will find you run into a great many difficulties. As I said, after all, you have to trust somebody, and it looks to me as if we should trust the President of the United States in the expenditure of this million-dollar emergency fund.

Mr. HARDY. I certainly agree that we should have confidence in the President of the United States. Certainly I do. But I do not believe these funds should be used for purposes prohibited by section 209, and we ought to be able to take some steps to preclude such use.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my general statement I said that representatives of the Bureau of the Budget when they appeared before our subcommittee responded I think very frankly, truthfully, and straightforwardly on this matter.

This is all explained on page 167 of the hearings where Mr. Staats gave us this information.

He said:

The study by the Draper Committee developed, in part, from requests from Members of the Senate that the President make a reappraisal of the relationship between the military and economic assistance aspects of the mutual security program.

Certainly that is in the national interest, in my book.

It was considered desirable, to assure an impartial report, that the study be financed from funds not connected with any particular agency of the Government. Moreover, since the study was aimed at permitting a personal review by the President, it was believed that the use of funds directly under the control of the President was appropriate. In addition, the funds of the mutual security program may be subject to certain general restrictions against making payments for expenses of committees or other similar bodies. For these reasons, mutual security funds were not used to finance the Draper committee study.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and that is because under the public law dealing with mutual security funds they were expressly prohibited from using them for propaganda purposes. It carried no devious language, as this bill does.

Mr. FENTON. I will say to the gentleman, under the basic law, the President should not be handicapped in this fashion, and I hope that the committee rejects this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure the gentleman will remember that 2 years ago this House appropriated a considerable amount of money—I do not remember the exact amount—and also the other body appropriated a special amount in the hundreds of thousands to finance a reexamination, a resurvey, a reevaluation of the whole mutual security program. Both houses together spent much more than the administration did for the Draper committee study of the same program. It seems to me only reasonable and proper that the administration should set up an ad hoc independent committee to take a fresh look at the whole operation. It had been under attack; there was dissatisfaction amongst supporters with parts of it; some things had not worked out as anticipated. Surely the administration would have been negligent if it had not inaugurated an independent survey even as each of the Houses of the Congress was doing. This special fund of the President's was

the proper one for the President to use in view of the national interest and security factors involved.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 139 of the hearings and to the table under "Executive Office of the President." The last item is "President's Committee on Fund Raising in the Federal Service." The reason I am asking the gentleman this question is this: I apparently scanned the whole hearings and the report and I find no reference or explanation of that particular committee, and every other committee has been referred to and explained. But, that particular one is not explained or referred to in any way in the hearings or the report.

Mr. FENTON. I think it permits the Executive Office to check on funds that are requested from Federal agencies throughout the Government.

Mr. FOLEY. The reason I raise the question is I was interested in knowing just exactly what this particular committee's functions were and are and will be in the next fiscal year, inasmuch as $49,000 is involved and four people are involved.

Mr. FENTON. In other words, this item refers to money for investigations on solicitations of funds from the personnel of the executive agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this debate should remind the Members who came to this House last that it has not been so very long since the newspapers and some Members of the House gave some of us a panning because of the way we spent the clerical allowance given us. So, perhaps, if we felt, some of us, that it was all right to spend the money allocated to us for clerk hire in the way we thought would give us the most information, the best results perhaps we should let the President spend the money given him as he judged best. I do not suppose he spends any of it himself. Somebody down there in whom he has confidence tells him how to do it, because he could not possibly know all the details. This discussion brings to mind a letter I received.

Permit me to read:

Recently there was an item in the Palladium in which they quoted you as saying that the constituents of the Congressmen and Senators are responsible for the vast spending of the Federal Government.

Now, I hope you will listen, because this gentleman, I assume, knows me. He lives in the Fourth Michigan District:

You must think the people back home are so dumb that they will swallow everything that comes out of Washington and think that if some Congressman says it, it must be the gospel truth. Well, you couldn't be farther from the straight and narrow. I am enclosing a clipping which to my mind is pretty accurate as to what the Government thinks of economy: "United States Spends $4,500 a Man on Laws' Toy Soldier Army."

And the piece refers in detail to apparently wasteful spending.

Anyway, that is it.

The Government spends hundreds of millions of dollars which the poor taxpayers know nothing about.

I suppose this is one item today.

What are you doing out there in Washington? Has the Congress completely forgotten the taxpayers? Did the constituents demand they spend $100 million for the Senators and Representatives for more plush office space?

He is coming back at me because I wrote that the people ask for unnecessary spending, otherwise we would not appropriate the money. Now he is calling my attention to some of our own unnecessary spending, and, incidentally, I am passing it on to the Members, calling attention to the dollars that we spend without our folks either asking or knowing anything about it. That is to say, he says that in a way we are equally guilty, and we are, but not to an equal degree. But, after all, we do try to, but I fear some waste will always creep in.

Did the folks back home demand that they double their salaries?

I have not had that particular request.

Incidentally, it did not take them all summer to do that, either, but it took them 2 years to add a few dollars to the war widows' pension. The latter they considered inflation. Were the taxpayers considered when they voted to increase the amount for their staffs by $50,000?

He is a little off on the amount. It is difficult to read some of this letter, and I shall put it in the RECORD, and I shall put my answer in, too, and that answer is not a plea of not guilty, it is a plea of confession and avoidance, and perhaps some of our colleagues ought to file a similar answer or plea.

What I am trying to say is this. Our constituents are aware of at least a part of what is happening.

We must each accept our share of the blame. We are not mainly at fault because our constitutents do advocate that we spend more and more.

The gentleman wrote:

Isn't it going a little too far when our two Senators each get $120,000 to pay their clerical help?

I would like to rent my front porch for $100 per month.

If the Congress really wanted to do something for the people, who pay the bills, they might investigate the different procurement agencies; Army, Navy, Air Force, and all the others, and get them organized on a business basis.

* * * * *

Very truly yours.

I answered the gentleman in this manner:

No; I do not think the people back home are so dumb that they will swallow everything that comes out of Washington. I know better. The people are neither—on the average—of more intelligence, nor more dumb than their elected representatives. We are all much the same.

You enclosed a clipping which purports to show an outrageous waste and I can point to many other similar situations.

You ask the reason: One is that the Government is so big that it is impossible for one person or one group to keep track of everything, and always there are a waster and a spender, not to mention a crook who manages to slip in every large group.

Am frank to admit that the Government spends hundreds of millions of dollars which the taxpayers know nothing about. Even the Representatives here do not know the whole story. "The half has never been told."

Again, one trouble is the size of the Government and the insistent demands of those who pay the cost. Each one asking that all the money be spent, but that a certain amount be spent for one thing and another group asking for another.

You ask, "What are you doing up there in Washington? Has Congress completely forgotten the taxpayer?"

Certainly not, and what are the taxpayers doing on projects which promote economy? Many ask but few want it.

If you know anything about my record, and I assume you do, you know there has never been a campaign in which I have been interested that I have not been called a tightwad, one who refuses to vote for the things the people desire.

Undoubtedly I have made mistakes and will continue to make them as long as I am here, but did you ever have a member of the State legislature or of Congress who did not make mistakes? Did you never make one?

No; I do not know of a constituent who asks that the Congress spend more money for new offices, but I do know that constituents have asked for additional services until Congressmen have needed more help and larger offices; and I do know, or at least I think I know, that we have wasted many millions on desirable but unneeded projects. Congress will probably continue to do so, so long as voters increase.

As for increasing our pay, we certainly have. And many a Congressmen could have made as much or more in the enterprise he left to come here.

Why do I stay?

Because I thought I could do something worthwhile—get a reduction in taxes and, perhaps some better laws. I have learned that I was shooting at the moon.

Never but on two occasions did I use all the money allotted to me for clerk hire, and that was unavoidable because of illness in the office force. When we were awarded $2,500 additional for expenses, I left the $2,500 in the U.S. Treasury until after the people had a chance to vote at the next election. Would you have let $2,500 lie on the shelf when all you had to do was to check against it?

As for the increase of staff pay, the standard of pay in Washington is different from what it is in Benton Harbor, and it is not too easy to get the work done by competent people. Not everyone can step into a congressional office and do a worthwhile job.

Personally, I do not know what the two Senators get, but I am quite certain that every Tom, Dick, and Harry in the State feels free to write them and demand an answer to any and every question which may occur to the writer.

You say you would like to rent your front porch for $100 per month.

No doubt, but would your front porch be any good to the Government?

The point is this—so far as I know, there is not even a rumor that there was more than one front porch rented by Congressmen. There are 436 Congressmen and it is not at all surprising to find some of them trying to increase their income through the use of their own property.

It is reported the Speaker of the House and the Republican leader pay $60 a month for office hire in their home districts. We are supposed to maintain an office in the district. I once paid for one in St. Joe, then found it more convenient to rent in my hometown and, naturally, I rented one at $60 a month (later $80 a month) from my own son. The office is fully equipped, is heated, a clerk is there and service is rendered. And the sign is on the door.

You write that if we wanted to do something for the people, we might investigate the different procurement agencies. Bless your heart, we are investigating all the time and we are all the time uncovering and correcting abuses and we catch heck for the investigation. As a matter of fact, I sometimes think we just go on a wild goose chase but I know that we correct many an abuse.

The gentleman concluded his letter with this statement:

"I don't expect you to answer this, Mr. HOFFMAN, as it has been my experience that they don't answer critical letters.

"No; they just call it another letter from a crank not worth answering."

I don't know what your experience has been, but I am of the opinion, and, of course, I may be mistaken, that usually you have had an answer where you ask a worthwhile question. It has been my practice to read and to answer every letter, even the abusive ones from people, not only those who live in the District, but letters from outsiders who are so completely mistaken.

The average Congressman is just as intelligent, just as able, as the average citizen. He comes from the people. He is elected by a majority of the people, after his opponent has dug up all the dirt that exists in an effort to show he should not have been elected.

A stock answer to letters like this one of yours is that if you feel so deeply, are willing to make the sacrifice, and think you can better the situation, why not take a whirl at it and become a candidate. Good luck to you and yours, and just paste this in your hat and look at it occasionally. The average Congressman is about the same in ability and patriotism as the average citizen.

Write me again when you feel like it. Such letters as yours are always helpful, spur us on to a greater effort to do the right thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 22, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 5, line 6, strike the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That section 209 of this Act shall be fully applicable to this appropriation."

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, and reserve that point of order.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk report the amendment again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

(The Clerk again reported the amendment.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, where is that period to be inserted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the amendment does not appear to be appropriate at the line indicated on page 5.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, there should be a period at the end of line 10. Is that what I have in the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment indicates line 6.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be revised to specify line 10 instead of line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 5, line 10, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That section 209 of this Act shall be fully applicable to this appropriation."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FENTON. I do, Mr. Chairman. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, this language has been in the bill for many years and it has been accepted. I believe that a point of order should stand against attempts at this time to eliminate this language.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how it can be said that this is legislation on an appropriation bill when it refers to a section of the bill itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that that section may have legislation in it and the fact that the amendment refers to a section of the bill is not an answer to the point of order.

Mr. HARDY. That may be true, Mr. Chairman, but I would certainly have to express the feeling to ask how is it improper anywhere in a piece of legislation to say that a section of the legislation is applicable to the rest of it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). Under the rules of the House, any language in an appropriation bill or any amendment to an appropriation bill which contains legislation is subject to a point of order. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand then that the Chairman has already ruled?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled on the question.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, would it be improper to suggest that actually this is a limitation and makes section 209 apply?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that on the face of the amendment, it is not a proper limitation on the funds.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think I ought to explain my purpose in offering this amendment. The committee has stated that it was its purpose to insure that section 209 was applicable to this entire act. Let me ask my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, if I understood him correctly, to construe that it was the intent of the committee that section 209 would be applicable to this particular appropriation?

Mr. ANDREWS. It was the intent of the committee, and section 209 reads as follows——

Mr. HARDY. I know how the language reads, but I would just like to know if it was the intent of the committee to make it applicable to this appropriation.

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee made this statement in the report which I would like to read to the gentleman:

In recommending an appropriation in the full amount requested, the committee hopes that he utmost restraint will be exercised in the use of this fund for the purposes intended as stated in the appropriation language.

That is as far as the committee wanted to go. We do not want to hamstring the President as to how he should use the money.

Mr. HARDY. So it can be understood from the gentleman from Alabama that it was the intent of the committee to permit the use of this fund for propaganda purposes, if the Chief Executive saw fit to do so?

Mr. ANDREWS. I would say "Yes."

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman very much. Now the purpose of the committee is clear and the language in the report is nothing but a lot of double talk.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Certainly, the committee report does not control this matter. It is controlled by the language of the bill. Not only was it the intent of the committee, but section 209 says, "No part of any appropriation contained in this act, and so forth." The appropriation that the gentleman refers to is certainly contained in this act. So not only was it the intent of the committee but it is the express provision of the bill itself, which the committee recommends to this body that section 209 shall apply to every appropriation item in the bill.

Mr. HARDY. Now I ask my friend from the Third Virginia District if he considers the comment which he has just made to be actually in conflict with the comment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GARY. What I have said is not in any way in conflict with what the gentleman from Alabama has said.

Mr. HARDY. Then I do not understand, because to my way of thinking

the gentleman's remarks are in conflict with what the gentleman from Alabama says. If I understand it incorrectly, I would certainly like to be corrected.

Mr. GARY. Subject to section 209—the committee cannot have any intent other than that expressed in the law.

Mr. HARDY. If that is true then, certainly the language which I have suggested would be entirely appropriate, and unless the committee desires to circumvent its own section 209, then my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GARY. It would not be appropriate. It would be extraneous because it is absolutely unnecessary. The bill already provides exactly what the gentleman is trying to reach by his amendment.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman knows, does he not that on previous occasions this very thing has happened, that funds from this appropriation have been used for the purpose of influencing legislation.

Mr. GARY. And other laws of the Nation have been violated from time to time without anything being done about it.

Mr. HARDY. Do I understand then that the gentleman is contending actually that the executive branch has deliberately caused laws to be violated?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is saying that if the reports to which reference has been made are propaganda then the law has been violated. As the gentleman stated previously, however, that may be a question of opinion.

Mr. HARDY. Let me say just one more word in connection with the motivation behind this amendment. I have been told that a certain business organization was in Washington pressurizing the Congress for the enactment of certain legislation this last year and spent some $65,000 which they said they were going to be repaid from this emergency fund. Now I do not know whether the Appropriations Committee was advised of that; presumably they were not. I am not sure myself. This came from a very reliable source who was familiar with efforts being made to secure passage by Congress of certain legislation. The statement was made that reimbursement was to be made from this fund.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that $3 million of this fund was used for an educational exhibit over in Moscow not so long ago.

Mr. HARDY. Certainly I think the President should have this fund, and my purpose in bringing it up was to focus attention to the violation, certainly of the purpose and intent of section 209. There ought to be some way that we could enforce that section to see that it is not violated, and it seemed to me that the committee ought to assist in making that certain instead of raising a point of order.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just to keep the record straight, it is true that the President spent $3 million on an exhibit building in Moscow, but the money was out of foreign aid funds. I think it is rather farfetched to use foreign aid money for such a purpose, but that was what was done; it was not from this particular fund now under discussion. It was from the funds appropriated for foreign aid that the President spent the $3 million for the Moscow exhibition building.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's correction.

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: Page 5, line 10, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be spent in violation of the provisions of section 209."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VANIK. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio specifically places a limitation upon the use of funds appropriated in this act. It is, therefore, a limitation and is not subject to a point of order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to commend the gentleman for straightening out the language in such way as to accomplish the purpose I had in mind. It is a good amendment and it certainly should be supported by every Member of the House.

Mr. VANIK. I shall not take time to discuss this amendment for it has been thoroughly discussed. It merely makes the Emergency Fund subject to the provisions of section 209. I certainly think it is good legislation and should be adopted.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be defeated. I do not think we should hamstring, so to speak, the President in the use of this fund. As has been said by the gentleman from Virginia, if we cannot trust the President with $1 million we are living in a sad state indeed.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate on this amendment and I was just wondering if the gentlemen who are raising the question of whether this fund is being spent in accordance with law have asked for an opinion from the General Accounting Office? I ask for comment on that by the chairman of the committee or by any member of the committee. From the silence that greets my question I must say this sounds to me like a tempest in a teapot.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] was in the Chamber earlier when the debate started on this particular feature of the bill, but if he was here he will recall, I am sure, that the Budget Bureau testified before the committee that they had to resort to this fund; that they could not use mutual security funds because they were prohibited under the law from using them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason I raised the General Accounting Office question is because that is an arm of the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget is an arm of the executive department; and if the Members of Congress have any point to make on this, I would think they would go to the General Accounting Office to get their opinion. I think the gentleman from Virginia and the committee pointed to the actual issue: Is this propaganda or is it not? I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that on the basis of testimony by the President's own agency, the Bureau of the Budget, it was a propaganda enterprise; else they would not have been precluded from using mutual security funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would think the orderly procedure would be to refer it to the General Accounting Office for an opinion.

Mr. HARDY. This is in the nature of an appropriation which the General Accounting Office cannot look at.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VANIK), there were—ayes 24, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, simply to say that I hope the action this committee has just taken in refusing to adopt the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio is not going to be construed by the White House as a sanction by the Congress for the use of these funds for purposes prohibited by section 209.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United

States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Michigan: On page 9, lines 5 and 6, after "alien" strike out the words "from the Baltic countries".

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair would advise the gentleman that the amendment simply strikes out certain language in the bill.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, section 202 provides "no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States—including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States—whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person, first, is a citizen of the United States; second, is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date; third, is a person who owes allegiance to the United States; or, fourth, is an alien from the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence."

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for restricting employment of aliens to those originating in the Baltic States. I am sure that the committee had no intention to include a discriminatory provision in this bill but that it merely accepted language which had not been closely examined.

I would like to ask the opinion of the chairman of the committee on this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. We made no study of this. Several Members suggested that a language change be made. Our committee has had no opportunity to look into what effect such change might have. We suggest that the matter be taken up with the Senate committee to see if we cannot work out over there some solution that will be satisfactory to both sides.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. That would give us an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I do not believe that anyone in this House can think of a reason why we should accept a bill containing such a discriminatory provision. Nor would it be to the credit of the House to neglect an opportunity to strike this language out of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. We suggested that they take it up with the Senate committee and give our committee and the Senate committee an opportunity to study the effect it would have. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] made that statement in the well of the House this afternoon.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to point out that the language the gentleman seeks to strike from the bill seems to be subject to a point of order, because the gentleman is seeking to restore the appropriation nature of the bill by deleting a legislative provision. If the amendment is not agreed to, a point of order would lie against this particular language. It singles out Baltic aliens from those of other countries.

Mr. ANDREWS. I will say to the gentleman that this matter was brought to the attention of our committee after we got to the floor this afternoon. We have not had any opportunity to study it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The suggestion was made that Poland be added to that language. Frankly, our committee has given no consideration to it. In explaining the amendment to me during the deliberations of this bill here on the floor they said that the Department of Agriculture wanted it for some purpose. Now, just what effect the gentleman's amendment will have I have not the slightest idea, and I hope that the House will not adopt it and that it will be presented to some committee when they can go into it and consider the many ramifications. I am always afraid of some amendment offered on the floor of the House when the House does not have an opportunity to inquire into the many ramifications and the effect that it might have on other laws. Now, when I made my point of order I thought that this interfered with some other law. Whether it does or not I do not know. I think probably it might interfere with existing laws. I was trying to save the point of order if that was the case, but I think this, that it is a matter that should be considered very carefully, and I think if the gentleman will let this go to the Senate and consider it together with the amendment to add Poland, that it would be handled in a much more deliberative manner.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I do not believe this House should be a party to any such discriminatory limitation upon employment. The effect of my amendment would be to give the Government freedom to hire any qualified, legally resident, alien without regard to his national origin.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, this measure has been in the bill for a number of years, and we have had no chance to examine the effect of your proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman that I think the suggestion by our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is well taken. I certainly do not like to oppose anything that I know nothing about, practically. I have a number of people in my area that may be interested, too, in your proposal, but we should have the opportunity to study it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I merely want to say I do not think this is the sort of matter that requires any study. It is plain on its face. Here we have an opportunity to strike it and we should take the opportunity. I am sure that the gentleman has this amendment in the bill only because it has been in past bills, as he said. I think the time has come for us to change that language.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, I will say to the gentleman I think we should have a chance to study it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA of Michigan) there were—ayes 19, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VANIK. I make a point of order to the language on page 9, lines 5 and 6 "from the Baltic countries."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair must advise the gentleman that the point of order comes too late. That section has been read and amendments to the section have been considered. The point of order is overruled.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. ALBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. In its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with the recommendation that the committee report the bill forthwith with the following amendment: On page 5, line 10, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following language: "*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be spent in violation of the provisions of section 209."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, further proceedings under the bill will be postponed until Wednesday.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7343) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1½ hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow, and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7343, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will be recognized for 45 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries the appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Departments of State and Justice, the Federal judiciary and related agencies. Included in the related agencies, are the U.S. Information Agency and the Commission on Civil Rights.

We have a sad situation today, Mr. Chairman, in the loss of that great American, the distinguished and honorable former Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. He was a man of noble character, he was a man of the highest integrity, he was a man who had great courage. And he was a kindly man. I am proud to say that we were friends for many years. I was his guest on many occasions when he was Secretary of State. As ill as he was last December in Paris when he attended the NATO Council meeting, he came downstairs from his bed of pain to greet the group that accompanied me at that time. I have always had the highest respect for him. To Mrs. Dulles, her sons and daughter, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing the pending bill which includes the appropriations for the Department of State, I assure you I shall not make any remarks which might in the least impugn the integrity or the ability of the distinguished late Secretary of State. I do not bring this bill here to the floor today of my own choice. The date for the consideration of this bill was set by the leadership of the House almost 3 weeks ago. I am sure we can consider the matter of appropriations for the Department of State on the basis I have suggested.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I should like to say I appreciate the remarks just made by the gentleman from New York. While the gentleman from New York on occasion has had differences of opinion as to what just ought to be done with this particular appropriation bill having to do with the Department of State, I do not recall that the gentleman ever entered into personalities, and I am quite sure there will be no personalities involved today, and that the discussion will proceed in an orderly fashion based on what best ought to be done for the welfare of the country.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentleman from Indiana that that is my purpose. Since the committee has seen fit to make certain cuts in appropriations with regard to the Department of State, I want everyone present to understand that the late Secretary worked as many as 16 and 18 hours a day, that he was busy most of the time with our foreign policy, and that that was as it should have been. Any criticism will be directed to certain subordinates who have charge of the administrative phases of the Department of State activities.

Before I proceed to explain the bill, Mr. Chairman, I should like to extend my thanks and appreciation to my colleagues on the subcommittee who have labored long and assiduously on the pending bill. The fact of the matter is that the hearings on this bill took place over a period of more than 3 months. I personally am indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

I would be remiss indeed if I did not acknowledge with thanks the great assistance we had from the staff assistant to the subcommittee, who has been with us now for a great many years, Mr. Jay B. Howe.

The bill now before you carries appropriations which total $649,896,700. This compares with total budget estimates requested by the President in the amount of $682,387,600.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 28, 1959
For actions of May 27, 1959
86th-1st, No. 86

CONTENTS

Agricultural attaches....5
Appropriations.....3,4,7
Area redevelopment....7,10
Budget.....15
Contracts.....8
Education.....9
Farm credit.....12
Farm program.....14
Forest highways.....7
Housing.....15
Industrial uses.....19
Lands.....17
Minerals.....17
Personnel.....20
Reclamation.....6
Recreation.....21
Reorganization.....1
Research.....9,13,18
Retirement.....20
Stockpiling.....11
Weights and measures....18
Wheat.....2,16

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated bill to extend Reorganization Act. Rep. Cooley announced that June 1 was not "deadline" for passage of wheat bill. House passed: General government matters appropriation bill. State-Justice appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. REORGANIZATION. Began and concluded debate on H. R. 5140, to extend the time to June 1, 1961, during which reorganization plans transmitted by the President to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949 may take effect (pp. 8265-74).

   Agreed to the committee amendment limiting extention of the Act to June 1, 1961 (as introduced the bill would have extended the Act permanently) (pp. 8272-4).

   Rep. McCormack announced that further consideration of the bill will be postponed until Tues., June 2 (p. 8282).

2. WHEAT. Rep. Cooley stated that there was "no foundation" for the "general impression that there is some kind of a deadline of June 1 on the enactment of new wheat legislation," that the pending wheat bills "require that the Secretary make the very same proclamation next Monday that he would make if no wheat bill were passed this year," that "there is no reason for extending further the date on which the Secretary makes this announcement, nor is there any reason ... for trying to rush through Congress, merely on account of the June 1 announcement, the wheat legislation which is now pending," and concluded that "the counsel of the Committee on Agriculture has been in touch with high-ranking officials of the Department of Agriculture within the past 2 hours, and they have flatly stated that there is no reason why the Secretary cannot make his scheduled

announcement on June 1 and that they are not in favor of postponing further the date of this announcement." p. 8277

3. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Passed without amendment this bill, H. R. 7176. Rejected, 171 to 229, a motion by Rep. Gross to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee. p. 8262

4. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Passed with amendment this bill, H. R. 7343. Rejected a motion by Rep. Williams to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee. pp. 8262-3

5. AGRICULTURAL ATTACHES. Received from this Department a proposed bill authorizing the detail of agricultural attaches to duties in the U. S. without reductio in grade; to Agriculture Committee. p. 8288

6. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7155, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, Calif. (H. Rept. 399). p. 8288

7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee was granted permission until midnight Thurs., May 28, to file reports on the legislative branch and the Defense Department appropriation bills. p. 8261

H. R. 7349, the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for 1960, includes $37,100,000 for forest highways, to be derived from the highway trust fund; provides that unexpended balances as of June 30, 1959, of approximately $7,100,000 heretofore appropriated for forest highways are to be rescinded and credited to miscellaneous receipts; includes $300,000 for the Office of Area Development for an increased program of technical assistance and field consultation to State and local groups who request guidance in organizing and carrying out economic development programs; and includes funds for the Census Bureau, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Office of Business Economics, Patent Office, Bureau of Public Roads, National Bureau of Standards, Weather Bureau, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Small Business Administration, and Tariff Commission.

8. CONTRACTS. Passed, 379 to 7, without amendment H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 4 years, until June 30, 1963. Rejected, 153 to 246, a motion by Rep. Simpson to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report the bill back with an amendment extending the Act to Sept. 30, 1961. pp. 8263-5

9. EDUCATION. Rep. Teller submitted and discussed "a comprehensive eight-point legislative program for improving education," including provisions for fellowship grants for post-college research and study, and grants for construction of State and municipal colleges and college research and laboratory facilities. pp. 8277-82

10. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Flood urged enactment of area redevelopment legislation and inserted a factsheet, "Area Redevelopment Fact Sheet No. 61: New York State." pp. 8282-7

11. STOCKPILING. Received from OCDM a report on the strategic and critical material stockpiling program, July 1 - Dec. 31, 1958. p. 8288

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 105 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1959 No. 86

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, May 28, 1959, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1959

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 4: 8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair.*

O Thou eternal Spirit of the living God, inspire us during this day with a vivid assurance of Thy divine guidance in our search and struggles to find the right solution to life's varied and difficult problems.

Grant that through the discipline of hard experiences and trying circumstances we may learn the needed lessons of patience and perseverance.

May we never yield to moods of defeatism and despair and allow our energies and resources to be weakened and dissipated by fears and anxieties.

Give us the unfaltering confidence that there is a moral and spiritual power in the universe which is working for righteousness and justice, however seemingly frail and feeble our own human efforts and achievements.

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

SENATE RESOLUTION 124

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. John Foster Dulles, a former Senator from the State of New York, and a former Secretary of State.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 19. An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard.

APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1960 FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, that is May 28, to file two reports—one on the appropriation bill for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1960 and the other on the Department of Defense appropriation for fiscal year 1960.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask when it is proposed to bring these bills up?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the legislative appropriation bill will be programed for Monday, and the Defense Department appropriation bill for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. I ask this because we need a little time to find out what is in these bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the gentleman from Iowa to know that I have no controversy with him at all or with his inquiring mind in this respect, but I am simply answering the gentleman's question to say that it is the intention to program the legislative appropriation bill for Monday and to program the Defense Department appropriation bill for Tuesday and Wednesday. Of course, if the gentleman from Iowa wants to inquire when the bills will be available and the reports and so forth, that is another question.

Mr. GROSS. Can the defense bill be taken up Wednesday so that we might have some time?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention to bring the Defense Department appropriation bill up on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. That does not leave very much time, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. You would have 6 days on the defense bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on both bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Betts	Harris	Perkins
Boggs	Hiestand	Pillion
Bonner	Holland	Reece, Tenn.
Bray	Johnson, Md.	Spence
Brooks, La.	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Casey	Kearns	Teague, Tex.
Downing	Laird	Watts
Durham	Landrum	Withrow
Fogarty	Mason	
Hall	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to recommit the bill H.R. 7176, the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1960.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with the recommendation that the committee report the bill forthwith with the following amendment: On page 5, line 10, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following language: *"Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be spent in violation of the provisions of section 209."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 229, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—171

Abbitt	Church	Hechler
Abernethy	Clark	Hemphill
Adair	Coad	Henderson
Alexander	Collier	Hoffman, Ill.
Alford	Colmer	Hoffman, Mich.
Alger	Cunningham	Hogan
Andersen, Minn.	Daniels	Holifield
	Davis, Ga.	Holt
Anderson, Mont.	Dent	Jennings
	Derwinski	Johansen
Ashley	Devine	Johnson, Calif.
Ashmore	Dingell	Johnson, Colo.
Bailey	Dooley	Johnson, Wis.
Barden	Dorn, S.C.	Kasem
Barr	Dowdy	Kee
Barrett	Doyle	Kilday
Beckworth	Dulski	Kilgore
Bennett, Fla.	Fallon	King, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Fascell	Kitchin
Berry	Feighan	Knox
Blatnik	Flynn	Kowalski
Blitch	Flynt	Langen
Bosch	Foley	Lankford
Bow	Fountain	Lennon
Bray	Frazier	Lesinski
Breeding	Friedel	Lipscomb
Brewster	Gathings	McDonough
Brock	George	McGinley
Brooks, Tex.	Granahan	McMillan
Broomfield	Grant	McSween
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Budge	Green, Pa.	Machrowicz
Burdick	Griffiths	Mack, Ill.
Burleson	Gross	Martin
Byrne, Pa.	Haley	Matthews
Carter	Hardy	Meader
Cederberg	Hargis	Metcalf
Chelf	Harrison	Meyer
Miller, Clem	Rivers, Alaska	Teague, Tex.
	Rogers, Fla.	Teller
Miller, George P.	Rogers, Tex.	Thompson, Tex.
	Roush	Thomson, Wyo.
Monagan	Rutherford	Toll
Morris, N. Mex.	Santangelo	Tuck
Moss	Saylor	Ullman
Nix	Scherer	Utt
Norrell	Scott	Vanik
O'Hara, Mich.	Shipley	Wampler
Oliver	Short	Wharton
Pfost	Simpson, Ill.	Whitener
Poage	Slack	Whitten
Poff	Smith, Calif.	Wier
Porter	Smith, Iowa	Williams
Prokop	Smith, Kans.	Winstead
Rains	Smith, Miss.	Wolf
Randall	Smith, Va.	Wright
Reuss	Stratton	Young
Rhodes, Ariz.	Sullivan	
Rhodes, Pa.	Teague, Calif.	

NAYS—229

Addonizio	Ford	Multer
Albert	Forrester	Mumma
Allen	Frelinghuysen	Murphy
Andrews	Fulton	Murray
Arends	Gallagher	Natcher
Aspinall	Gary	Nelsen
Auchincloss	Gavin	Norblad
Avery	Giaimo	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Gray	O'Brien, N.Y.
Baker	Griffin	O'Hara, Ill.
Baldwin	Gubser	O'Neill
Baring	Hagen	Osmers
Barry	Halleck	Ostertag
Bass, N.H.	Halpern	Passman
Bass, Tenn.	Harmon	Patman
Bates	Hays	Pelly
Baumhart	Healey	Philbin
Becker	Hébert	Pilcher
Belcher	Herlong	Pirnie
Bentley	Hess	Powell
Boland	Hoeven	Preston
Bolling	Holtzman	Price
Bolton	Horan	Pucinski
Bowles	Hosmer	Quie
Boyle	Huddleston	Quigley
Brademas	Hull	Rabaut
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Ray
Brown, Ga.	Irwin	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Mo.	Jackson	Riehlman
Broyhill	Jarman	Riley
Buckley	Jensen	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Jonas	Robison
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Bush	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Karsten	Rogers, Mass.
Cahill	Karth	Rooney
Canfield	Kastenmeier	Roosevelt
Cannon	Kelth	Rostenkowski
Carnahan	Kelly	St. George
Celler	Keogh	Saund
Chamberlain	Kilburn	Schenck
Chenoweth	King, Utah	Schwengel
Chiperfield	Kirwan	Selden
Coffin	Kluczynski	Shelley
Cohelan	Lafore	Sheppard
Conte	Lane	Sikes
Cook	Latta	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Levering	Sisk
Corbett	Libonati	Springer
Cramer	Lindsay	Steed
Curtin	Loser	Stubblefield
Curtis, Mass.	McCormack	Taber
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Thomas
Daddario	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Dague	McFall	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	McGovern	Thornberry
Dawson	McIntire	Tollefson
Delaney	Mack, Wash.	Trimble
Denton	Madden	Udall
Derounian	Magnuson	Van Pelt
Diggs	Mahon	Van Zandt
Dixon	Mailliard	Vinson
Dollinger	Marshall	Wainwright
Donohue	May	Wallhauser
Dorn, N.Y.	Merrow	Walter
Downing	Michel	Weaver
Dwyer	Miller, N.Y.	Weis
Edmondson	Milliken	Westland
Elliott	Mills	Widnall
Everett	Minshall	Willis
Evins	Mitchell	Wilson
Farbstein	Montoya	Yates
Fenton	Moore	Younger
Fino	Moorhead	Zablocki
Fisher	Morris, Okla.	Zelenko
Flood	Morrison	
Forand	Moulder	

NOT VOTING—33

Anfuso	Bonner	Durham
Betts	Boykin	Fogarty
Boggs	Casey	Garmatz
Glenn	Laird	Reece, Tenn.
Hall	Landrum	Rivers, S.C.
Harris	Mason	Siler
Hiestand	Moeller	Spence
Holland	Morgan	Staggers
Johnson, Md.	O'Konski	Taylor
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Watts
Kearns	Pillion	Withrow

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hiestand for, with Mr. Morgan against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Moeller for, with Mr. Betts against.
Mr. Johnson of Maryland for, with Mr. Kearns against.
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ADDONIZIO, Mr. MOULDER, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. BARRY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1960

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of the bill H.R. 7343, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, on which a separate vote is demanded.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 19, line 20, immediately preceding "For" insert the following: "For construction of a maximum security institution on a site to be selected by the Attorney General, $2,000,000."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 266, nays 133, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—266

Abbitt	Bailey	Blatnik
Abernethy	Baker	Blitch
Addonizio	Baldwin	Boland
Albert	Baring	Bolling
Alford	Barr	Bowles
Allen	Barrett	Boyle
Anderson, Mont.	Barry	Brademas
	Bass, Tenn.	Breeding
Ashley	Beckworth	Brewster
Ashmore	Bennett, Fla.	Brock
Ayres	Bennett, Mich.	Brooks, La.

H. R. 7176

AN ACT

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 28, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Execu-
5 tive Office of the President and sundry general Goverment
6 agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

4 For compensation of the President, including an expense
5 allowance at the rate of $50,000 per annum as authorized
6 by the Act of January 19, 1949 (3 U.S.C. 102), $150,000.

7 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary for The White House Office,
10 including not to exceed $215,000 for services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
12 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as
13 the President may specify, and other personal services
14 without regard to the provisions of law regulating the em-
15 ployment and compensation of persons in the Government
16 service; newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and
17 travel, and official entertainment expenses of the President,
18 to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $2,221,000.

19 SPECIAL PROJECTS

20 For expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the
21 President in connection with special projects, to be expended
22 in his discretion and without regard to such provisions of
23 law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the
24 compensation and employment of persons in the Government
25 service as he may specifiy, $1,500,000: *Provided,* That not

1 to exceed 10 per centum of this appropriation may be used
2 to reimburse the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,
3 The White House Office", for administrative services.

4 EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

5 For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refur-
6 nishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including elec-
7 tric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the
8 Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be
9 expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding
10 the provisions of this or any other Act, $475,000.

11 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget,
14 including not to exceed $110,000 for expenses of travel, and
15 not to exceed $20,000 for services as authorized by section
16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
17 not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $4,665,000.

18 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out
21 its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C.
22 1021), including newspapers and periodicals (not exceed-
23 ing $400); not exceeding $15,000 for expenses of travels
24 and press clippings (not exceeding $300); $395,000.

1 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the National Security
4 Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
6 in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; and acceptance
7 and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services;
8 $792,000.

9 PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
10 ORGANIZATION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the President's Advisory
13 Committee on Government Organization, established by
14 Executive Order 10432 of January 24, 1953, including serv-
15 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
16 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem
17 for individuals, $57,500.

18 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

19 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT,
20 NATIONAL DEFENSE

21 For expenses necessary to enable the President, through
22 such officers or agencies of the Government as he may desig-
23 nate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding
24 the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation
25 and employment of persons in the Government service as

1 he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies
2 affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may
3 arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year,
4 $1,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
5 shall be available for allocation to finance a function or
6 project for which function or project a budget estimate of
7 appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the
8 Eighty-sixth Congress, and such appropriation denied after
9 consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Represent-
10 atives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

11 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
14 the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the
15 acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries;
16 purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national
17 cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and
18 its Territories and possessions; not to exceed $70,000 for
19 expenses of travel; rent of office and garage space in foreign
20 countries; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance
21 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
22 by law of such countries; $1,295,000: *Provided,* That where
23 station allowance has been authorized by the Department
24 of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at
25 certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be author-

1 ized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Com-
2 mission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this
3 appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of
4 such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on
5 business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces
6 serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may
7 be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian mem-
8 bers of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Com-
9 mission shall reimburse other Government agencies, includ-
10 ing the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of
11 personnel assigned to it.

12 CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

13 Not to exceed $160,000 of funds heretofore appropri-
14 ated under this head shall be available for necessary ex-
15 penses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II
16 memorials, erected under the authority of the Act of July
17 25, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 123), including travel and such other
18 purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper,
19 and such amount may be expended without regard to the
20 provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the ex-
21 penditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall
22 not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submis-
23 sion of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting
24 Office for audit): *Provided*, That, when in the discretion

1 of the head of any other Government agency it would be in
2 the public interest, personnel, services, supplies, equipment,
3 and facilities of such agency may be furnished without reim-
4 bursement to the Commission for the purposes of these dedi-
5 cations.

6 During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $5,000 of
7 funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be avail-
8 able for travel expenses (other than in connection with
9 dedications of memorials).

10 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary to carry on the activities of the
13 Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services
14 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
15 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for in-
16 dividuals; not to exceed $12,000 for expenses of travel;
17 advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies
18 for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the
19 functions of the Commission; hire of motor vehicles for field
20 use only; and employment of aliens; $458,000, of which
21 $50,000 shall be derived only from the war claims fund
22 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
23 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948) and not to be
24 available for obligation after June 30, 1960.

1 SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities
4 Control Board, including services as authorized by section
5 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to
6 exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed
7 $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals,
8 $380,000.

9 TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

11 SEC. 201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
12 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
13 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
15 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed
16 at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum
17 shall be $1,950.

18 SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-
19 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in
20 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation
21 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United
22 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of
23 which is owned by the Government of the United States)
24 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless
25 such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a

1 person in the service of the United States on the date of
2 enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had
3 filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the
4 United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes
5 allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from the
6 Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for
7 permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this
8 section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be con-
9 sidered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this
10 section with respect to his status have been complied with:
11 *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit
12 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined
13 not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one
14 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause
15 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
16 provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any pay-
17 ment made to any officer or employee contrary to the
18 provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the
19 Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citi-
20 zens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of
21 those countries allied with the United States in the current
22 defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators,
23 or to temporary employment in the field service (not to
24 exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

1 SEC. 203. Appropriations of the executive departments
2 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
3 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
4 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
5 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
6 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
7 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
8 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
9 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
10 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
11 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
12 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made
13 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
14 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
15 hereby.

16 SEC. 204. No part of any appropriation for the current
17 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid
18 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or
19 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to
20 approve the nomination of said person.

21 SEC. 205. No part of any appropriation contained in
22 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be
23 used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and
24 future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and
25 such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the

1 understanding that latest published cumulative annual
2 pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be
3 furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume
4 for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal
5 Digest.

6 SEC. 206. Funds made available by this or any other
7 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year
8 of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
9 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),
10 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
11 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia;
12 services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August
13 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under
14 this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable
15 to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified
16 in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,*
17 That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative
18 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other
19 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be
20 correspondingly reduced.

21 SEC. 207. No part of any funds of or available to any
22 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
23 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
24 purchase or construction of any office building, without
25 specific authority in law therefor, primarily for occupancy

1 by any department or agency of the United States Govern-
2 ment or by any corporation owned by the United States
3 Government.

4 SEC. 208. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of
5 July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including
6 currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may
7 be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which
8 appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including
9 the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of
10 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made
11 to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency
12 concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange
13 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be
14 used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar
15 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by
16 law, without reimbursement to the Treasury: *Provided*
17 *further,* That nothing in section 1415 of the Act of
18 July 15, 1952, or in this section shall be construed
19 to prevent the making of new or the carrying out
20 of existing contracts, agreements, or executive agree-
21 ments for periods in excess of one year, in any case
22 where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements
23 for periods in excess of one year were permitted prior to the

1 enactment of this Act under section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus
2 Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1641
3 (b) (2)), and the performance of all such contracts, agree-
4 ments, or executive agreements shall be subject to the avail-
5 ability of appropriations for the purchase of credits as
6 provided by law.

7 SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation contained in
8 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
9 individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act,
10 shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed
11 to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

12 SEC. 210. (a) Section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental
13 Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C.
14 200 (b)), is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in con-
15 nection with the submission of all requests for proposed
16 appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of
17 each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obli-
18 gations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as
19 defined in subsection (a) hereof."

20 (b) Section 1 (c) of the Act of July 25, 1956 (70
21 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701 (c)), is amended by striking the
22 words "reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supple-

1 mental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830: 31 U.S.C.
2 200(b)).”

3 SEC. 211. This Act may be cited as the “General Gov-
4 ernment Matters Appropriation Act, 1960”.

Passed the House of Representatives May 27, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

MAY 28, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

14. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report to the full committee this bill, H. R. 7176. p. D498

15. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Humphrey commended the action of the House in passing H. R. 3610, the water pollution bill, and inserted an editorial in support of this bill and S. 805, his companion bill. p. 10284

16. CONSERVATION CORPS. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter in support of his bill, S. 812, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. p. 10284

17. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1285, to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry (S. Rept. 402), and the bill was subsequently referred to the Finance Committee. pp. 10187, 10201

18. LANDS. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 1617, to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the U. S. over land in the several States used for Federal purposes (S. Rept. 405). p. 10187

19. SCIENCE. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 1851, to establish a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology (S. Rept. 408). p. 10293

20. WILDLIFE; ALASKA. Sen. Gruening stated that he opposed an Interior sponsored bill, S. 1899, to provide for the establishment of an Arctic wildlife range in Alaska, because "withdrawal of this land would, to a large extent, nullify Alaska's control of its own wildlife resources," listed other reasons for his opposition, and inserted two letters on the subject. pp. 10192-3

21. TRADE; IMPORTS. Sen. Wiley expressed concern over the imports coming into this country, stated that one person estimated they had "taken over ... 5 percent to 10 percent ... of the American market" and that if the present import percentages could be frozen through the use of a quota, "the remainder of our market could be retained." pp. 10189-90

22. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Wiley explained his bill S. 265, to establish a Country Life Commission, stated that "the time has come for a reevaluation of the whole farm picture, not on a fragmentary basis, but rather from a long-range viewpoint," and inserted several letters in support of his bill. pp. 10194-6

23. CONTRACTS. The Finance Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (S. Rept. 407). p. 10187

24. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 22. p. 10293

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. RECREATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Neuberger inserting two editorials favoring the establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Area. pp. A5248-9

26. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Rep. Neal Smith, Iowa, inserted Gov. Loveless', Iowa, and Rep. Loser inserted Mayor West's, Nashville, Tenn., statements befor the Senate Government Operations Committee in support of proposed bills to establish a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. pp. A5249-51, A 5255

Rep. Conte inserted a Mass. State Senate resolution supporting this proposed legislation. p. A5279

27. INTEREST RATES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dulski criticizing the President's special message "calling for abolition of the legal ceiling on Government bond interest rates ..." p. A5251

28. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Johnson, Colo., inserting an announcement of the completion of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. pp. A5251-2

29. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Extension of remarks of Rep. McCormack inserting a report made by the Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare showing amount of surplus property which has been made available to the States for health, education, and civil defense purposes. pp. A5254-5

30. MUTUAL SECURITY. Various speeches in the House during the debate on the proposed mutual security authorization bill. pp. A5258-9, A5259-60, A5265-6, A5266

31. MONOPOLIES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Celler announcing the commencement of hearings (June 25 and 26) on bills which amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to provide for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances. p. A5271

32. FAIR TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell inserting Vice President Nixon's letter "in opposition to fair trade legislation." pp. A5284-5

3. EGG PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Rhodes discussing the "critical period of adjustment" of the poultry industry, commending this Department's program, and inserting an article, "The Egg Crisis." pp. A5286-7

34. WHEAT. Speech in the House by Rep. Bass during debate on the wheat bill. pp. A5289-90

BILLS INTRODUCED

35. WILDLIFE. H. R. 7824, by Rep. Flynn (by request), H. R. 7825, by Rep. Johnson, Wis. (by request), H. R. 7826, by Rep. Kastenmeier (by request), H. R. 7827, by Rep. Reuss (by request), H. R. 7828, by Rep. Zablocki (by request), and H. R. 7834, by Rep. O'Konski, to amend the act providing aid for the States in wildlife restoration projects with respect to the apportionment of such aid; to Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

36. CONSERVATION. H. R. 7831, by Rep. Toll, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to Education and Labor Committee.

37. BUILDINGS. H. R. 7832, by Rep. Elliott, to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government; to Public Works Committee.

38. CCC. H. R. 7848, by Rep. Hosmer, to repeal price support subsidies and direct the sale of Commodity Credit Corporation inventory; to Agriculture Committee.

Calendar No. 416

86TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 422

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

JUNE 22, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7176]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$13, 338, 500
Amount of increase by Senate (net)	230, 000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	13, 568, 500
Amount of appropriations, 1959	13, 165, 370
Amount of regular estimates, 1960	13, 608, 500
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the estimates for 1960	40, 000
Over the appropriations for 1959	403, 130

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

4 For compensation of the President, including an expense
5 allowance at the rate of $50,000 per annum as authorized
6 by the Act of January 19, 1949 (3 U.S.C. 102), $150,000.

7 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary for The White House Office,
10 including not to exceed $215,000 for services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
12 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as
13 the President may specify, and other personal services
14 without regard to the provisions of law regulating the em-
15 ployment and compensation of persons in the Government
16 service; newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and
17 travel, and official entertainment expenses of the President,
18 to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $2,221,000.

19 SPECIAL PROJECTS

20 For expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the
21 President in connection with special projects, to be expended
22 in his discretion and without regard to such provisions of
23 law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the
24 compensation and employment of persons in the Government
25 service as he may specifiy, $1,500,000: *Provided,* That not

1 to exceed 10 per centum of this appropriation may be used
2 to reimburse the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,
3 The White House Office", for administrative services.

4 EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

5 For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refur-
6 nishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including elec-
7 tric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the
8 Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be
9 expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding
10 the provisions of this or any other Act, $475,000.

11 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget,
14 including not to exceed $110,000 for expenses of travel, and
15 not to exceed $20,000 for services as authorized by section
16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
17 not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $4,665,000.

18 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out
21 its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C.
22 1021), including newspapers and periodicals (not exceed-
23 ing $400); not exceeding $15,000 for expenses of travel;
24 and press clippings (not exceeding $300); $395,000.

1 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the National Security
4 Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
6 in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; and acceptance
7 and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services;
8 $792,000.

9 PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
10 ORGANIZATION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the President's Advisory
13 Committee on Government Organization, established by
14 Executive Order 10432 of January 24, 1953, including serv-
15 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
16 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem
17 for individuals, $57,500.

18 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

19 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT,
20 NATIONAL DEFENSE

21 For expenses necessary to enable the President, through
22 such officers or agencies of the Government as he may desig-
23 nate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding
24 the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation
25 and employment of persons in the Government service as

1 he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies
2 affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may
3 arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year,
4 $1,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
5 shall be available for allocation to finance a function or
6 project for which function or project a budget estimate of
7 appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the
8 Eighty-sixth Congress, and such appropriation denied after
9 consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Represent-
10 atives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

11 *Expenses of Management Improvement*

12 *For expenses necessary to assist the President in improv-*
13 *ing the management of executive agencies and in obtaining*
14 *greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of*
15 *more efficient business methods in Government operations,*
16 *including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of*
17 *August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals*
18 *not to exceed $75 per diem, by allocation to any agency or*
19 *office in the executive branch for the conduct, under the gen-*
20 *eral direction of the Bureau of the Budget, of examinations*
21 *and appraisals of, and the development and installation of*
22 *improvements in, the organization and operations of such*
23 *agency or of other agencies in the executive branch, $250,000,*
24 *to remain available until expended, and to be available with-*

1 *out regard to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679*
2 *of the Revised Statutes, as amended.*

3 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
6 the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the
7 acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries;
8 purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national
9 cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and
10 its Territories and possessions; not to exceed $70,000 for
11 expenses of travel; rent of office and garage space in foreign
12 countries; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance
13 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
14 by law of such countries; $1,295,000: *Provided,* That where
15 station allowance has been authorized by the Department
16 of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at
17 certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be author-
18 ized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Com-
19 mission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this
20 appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of
21 such allowance: *Provided further,* That when traveling on
22 business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces
23 serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may
24 be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian mem-
25 bers of the Commission: *Provided further,* That the Com-

1 mission shall reimburse other Government agencies, includ-
2 ing the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of
3 personnel assigned to it.

4 CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

5 Not to exceed $160,000 of funds heretofore appropri-
6 ated under this head shall be available for necessary ex-
7 penses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II
8 memorials, erected under the authority of the Act of July
9 25, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 123), including travel and such other
10 purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper,
11 and such amount may be expended without regard to the
12 provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the ex-
13 penditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall
14 not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submis-
15 sion of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting
16 Office for audit): *Provided,* That, when in the discretion
17 of the head of any other Government agency it would be in
18 the public interest, personnel, services, supplies, equipment,
19 and facilities of such agency may be furnished without reim-
20 bursement to the Commission for the purposes of these dedi-
21 cations.

22 During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $5,000 of
23 funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be avail-
24 able for travel expenses (other than in connection with
25 dedications of memorials)

1 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary to carry on the activities of the
4 Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services
5 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
6 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for in-
7 dividuals; not to exceed $12,000 for expenses of travel;
8 advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies
9 for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the
10 functions of the Commission; hire of motor vehicles for field
11 use only; and employment of aliens; $458,000, of which
12 $50,000 shall be derived only from the war claims fund
13 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
14 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948) and not to be
15 available for obligation after June 30, 1960.

16 SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities
19 Control Board, including services as authorized by section
20 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to
21 exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed
22 $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals,
23 ~~$380,000~~ *$360,000.*

1 TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

3 SEC. 201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
4 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
5 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
6 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
7 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed
8 at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum
9 shall be $1,950.

10 SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-
11 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in
12 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation
13 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United
14 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of
15 which is owned by the Government of the United States)
16 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless
17 such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a
18 person in the service of the United States on the date of
19 enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had
20 filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the
21 United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes
22 allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from the
23 Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for

1 permanent residence: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this
2 section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be con-
3 sidered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this
4 section with respect to his status have been complied with:
5 *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit
6 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined
7 not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one
8 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause
9 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
10 provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any pay-
11 ment made to any officer or employee contrary to the
12 provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the
13 Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citi-
14 zens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of
15 those countries allied with the United States in the current
16 defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators,
17 or to temporary employment in the field service (not to
18 exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

19 SEC. 203. Appropriations of the executive departments
20 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
21 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
22 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
23 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
24 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
25 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed

1 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
2 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
3 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
4 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
5 tries: *Provided,* That the availability of appropriations made
6 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
7 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
8 hereby.

9 SEC. 204. No part of any appropriation for the current
10 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid
11 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or
12 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to
13 approve the nomination of said person.

14 SEC. 205. No part of any appropriation contained in
15 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be
16 used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and
17 future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and
18 such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the
19 understanding that latest published cumulative annual
20 pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be
21 furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume
22 for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal
23 Digest.

24 SEC. 206. Funds made available by this or any other
25 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year

1 of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
2 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),
3 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
4 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia;
5 services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August
6 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under
7 this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable
8 to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified
9 in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,*
10 That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative
11 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other
12 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be
13 correspondingly reduced.

14 SEC. 207. No part of any funds of or available to any
15 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
16 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
17 purchase or construction of any office building, without
18 specific authority in law therefor, primarily for occupancy
19 by any department or agency of the United States Govern-
20 ment or by any corporation owned by the United States
21 Government.

22 SEC. 208. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of
23 July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including
24 currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may
25 be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which

1 appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including
2 the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of
3 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made
4 to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency
5 concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange
6 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be
7 used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar
8 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by
9 law, without reimbursement to the Treasury: *Provided*
10 *further,* That nothing in section 1415 of the Act of
11 July 15, 1952, or in this section shall be construed
12 to prevent the making of new or the carrying out
13 of existing contracts, agreements, or executive agree-
14 ments for periods in excess of one year, in any case
15 where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements
16 for periods in excess of one year were permitted prior to the
17 enactment of this Act under section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus
18 Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1641
19 (b) (2)), and the performance of all such contracts, agree-
20 ments, or executive agreements shall be subject to the avail-
21 ability of appropriations for the purchase of credits as
22 provided by law.

23 SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation contained in
24 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
25 individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act,

1 shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed
2 to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.
3 SEC. 210. (a) Section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental
4 Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C.
5 200 (b)), is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in con-
6 nection with the submission of all requests for proposed
7 appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of
8 each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obli-
9 gations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as
10 defined in subsection (a) hereof."
11 (b) Section 1 (c) of the Act of July 25, 1956 (70
12 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701 (c)), is amended by striking the
13 words "reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supple-
14 mental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830: 31 U.S.C.
15 200 (b))."
16 SEC. 211. This Act may be cited as the "General Gov-
17 ernment Matters Appropriation Act, 1960".

Passed the House of Representatives May 27, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Calendar No. 416

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

[Report No. 422]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

MAY 28, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 22, 1959

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 24, 1959
For actions of June 23, 1959
86th-1st, No. 104

CONTENTS

Access roads.....39
Accounting.....6
Acreage allotments.....19
Agricultural appropriations.....38
Appropriations 1,2,3,5,23,24,38
Area redevelopment...26,42
Beef sales.....18
Contracts.....12
Cooperatives.....35
Electrification.....4
Employment.....43
Fair trade.....32
Farm income.....10
Farm labor.....30
Fats and oils.....8
Federal-State relations.18
Foreign affairs.....15,44
Foreign aid.....16
Foreign service.....45
Forestry.....14,34,39
Health.....6
Housing.....17
Inflation.....22
Information.....37
Lands.....46
Legislative program..16,24
Meat inspection.....7
Milk.....27
Monopolies.....21
Mutual security.....16
Nomination.....9
Peanuts.....19
Personnel.....6,20,43
Public Law 480.....13
Regulatory agencies.....33
River basin.....25
Soil bank.....31
State laws.....18,29
Stockpile.....8
Surplus food.....13
Surplus property.....40
Transportation.....11
TVA.....4,9,16
Vehicle operation.....20
Water pollution.....36
Watersheds.....28
Wildlife.....40,41

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed: State-Justice appropriation bill. Independent offices appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on housing bill. Sen. Murray and other Senators and Rep. Metcalf introduced and Sen. Murray discussed bill to authorize additional appropriations for forest access roads development.

SENATE

1. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Passed, 90 to 0, with amendments this bill, H. R. 7343 (pp. 10491-502, 10506-11). Conferees were appointed (p. 10511). House conferees have not yet been appointed.

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Passed, 89 to 1, as reported this bill, H. R. 7040 (pp. 10525-30). Conferees were appointed (p. 10530). House conferees have not yet been appointed.

3. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 6769 (S. Rept. 425). p. 10480

4. ELECTRIFICATION. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments H. R. 3460 to amend the TVA Act of 1933 so as to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds by TVA to finance additions to its power system (S.Rept. 426). p. 10480

5. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. This bill, H. R. 7176, was made the unfinished business for consideration today, June 24. p. 10530

6. PERSONNEL; ACCOUNTING. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report without amendment (but did not actually report) H. R. 6134, to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 so as to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years. p. D517

The "Daily Digest" states that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee "postponed action for 1 week on S. 2162, Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959." p. D517

7. MEAT INSPECTION. Both Houses received from GAO a report on the review of activities of the Meat Inspection Division of this Department. pp. 10479, 10618

8. FATS AND OILS. Received from GSA a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 265 million pounds of coconut oil from the national stockpile. p. 10478

9. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Brooks Hays to be a member of the Board of Directors of TVA. pp. 10514, 10540

10. FARM INCOME. Sen. Langer inserted a GTA Daily Radio Roundup discussing farm income, and stating that "farming continues to be a sort of island of recession in a sea of prosperity." p. 10504

11. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Schoeppel inserted a statement by Ernest J. Williams before the Transportation Council discussing the comprehensive study being made of transportation policy at the request of the President, including activities on which reports are expected to be made from the study. pp. 10504-6

12. CONTRACTS. Passed, with amendments, H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 until December 31, 1961 (pp. 10511-2, 10514-6). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Butler to prohibit Government agencies from inserting provisions in certain contracts which would limit profits under the contract (p. 10515).

13. SURPLUS FOODS. Sen. Humphrey inserted two articles, "Our Wheat Surplus: 100 Billion Loaves," and "Farm Surplus Bill Extension Vital," discussing the surplus food situation and activities under Public Law 480 for distributing such food abroad. pp. 10512-3

14. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse inserted a report prepared for him by the Small Business Administration listing timber sales by the Forest Service from tracts which had been set aside for competitive bidding by small business. p. 10534

15. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a list of bills on which hearings will be held by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs beginning July 6. p. 10489

16. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that S. 1451, the mutual security authorization bill, and H. R. 3460, the TVA self-financing bill, will be considered in the next few days. pp. 10478, 10511

pressed with the job Mr. Floete is doing there in a very complex and difficult situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think that is true. We went into that situation very thoroughly. The job he is doing, which is of a very complex nature, is certainly outstanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would take 3 Philadelphia lawyers and 17 public accountants even to understand some of the bookkeeping being done. It is difficult for us to understand it. We try to keep our appropriations consistent with the purposes of the laws by which the agencies were established.

Mr. CARROLL. This is one of the reasons why I commended the able chairman of the subcommittee and my senior colleague from Colorado. I have been reading in the hearings their penetrating questions. It has been a difficult and massive job.

This is the purpose for which I put some of the questions, I may say for the RECORD. Does the Senator from Washington, who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and who is also chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, think the Congress has the power of investigation to find out what is going on in the agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Congress not only has the power and authority but has the responsibility to do so, because these agencies were established as arms of the Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator think it is presumptuous for representatives of the agencies to claim executive privilege when Congress wants to find out what is going on in the agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The agencies were created to administer the laws of Congress. I do not think it is presumptuous at all for Congress to want to know about the agencies it created. I commend anyone who takes on the job, as the Senator from Colorado has done, to ascertain what is going on. These agencies wield tremendous power in the economy of the country—much more than do the executive agencies of Government.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator say if the representatives of the agencies did not respond to inquiries of Congress, and claimed an executive privilege, the Appropriations Committee would examine them most closely when they appeared before the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Appropriations Committee will examine them closely on any of these matters.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the power of Congress. It is incident to the power of the purse.

If I may refer to page 216 of the hearings, I think it will be clearly illustrated what my colleague from Colorado was trying to ascertain with respect to the Federal Power Commission. My colleague was questioning Mr. Kuykendall the chairman of the FPC. Later he questioned Mr. Carl Kallina chief of the FPC Bureau of Gas Rates with respect to gas rate cases, which appears on page 216 of the hearings. I will read one sentence, and I ask unanimous consent that the whole paragraph may appear in the RECORD. It appears under the subheading "Independent Producer Rate Cases." A part of the sentence reads with Mr. Kallina speaking:

> At the end of fiscal 1959 we estimated we were going to have 1,264.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire paragraph be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> INDEPENDENT PRODUCER RATE CASES
>
> Then on the independent producer rate cases, if you will turn to page D–12, on the bottom tabulation you will see there we have an estimated figure of the number of independent producer rate cases at the end of 1958. The actual was 1,064 at the end of fiscal year 1958 and at the end of fiscal 1959 we estimated we were going to have 1,264. Actually, on December 31, 1958 we had 1,518, so there again the same thing prevails. We are having more cases than we anticipated.
>
> Senator MAGNUSON. If this amount were restored, are you pretty sure that you can get the people?
>
> Mr. KUYKENDALL. Yes, we are confident we can.

That many cases are on the docket, cluttering the docket. It is estimated there will be 2,000 cases of all descriptions cluttering the docket. How can that be in the public interest?

In my State of Colorado in 5 years we have had four successive gas rate increases, and not one case adjudicated by the FPC. These four cases involved $90 million of the consumers' funds subject to refund.

The Supreme Court only yesterday unanimously moved again to compel the FPC to act to protect the public interest in adjudicating gas rate cases.

I sincerely hope the important Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Agencies will put the needle to the regulatory agencies to insure that they will operate for the public interest. For my own part, in my Judiciary Subcommittee, if the agencies attempt to use Executive privilege—and this is why I want to make a record today—I will go to the Appropriations Committee, and I may even come to the bar of the Senate itself, because I think the ruling of Attorney General Brownell on Executive privilege in 1954 was not so extensive as to allow such regulatory agencies to claim Executive privilege.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illnesses in their families.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official committee business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—89

Alken	Engle	Martin
Allott	Ervin	McCarthy
Anderson	Frear	McNamara
Bartlett	Fulbright	Monroney
Beall	Gore	Morse
Bennett	Green	Morton
Bible	Gruening	Moss
Bridges	Hartke	Mundt
Bush	Hayden	Muskie
Butler	Hennings	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Prouty
Cannon	Holland	Proxmire
Capehart	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Humphrey	Robertson
Carroll	Jackson	Russell
Case, N.J.	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Church	Jordan	Smith
Clark	Keating	Sparkman
Cooper	Kefauver	Stennis
Cotton	Kennedy	Symington
Curtis	Kerr	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dodd	Langer	Wiley
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	Long	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Mansfield	

NAYS—1

Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—8

Goldwater	McGee	Schoeppel
Hart	Murray	Yarborough
McClellan	O'Mahoney	

So the bill (H.R. 7040) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously made, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inform Senators that we anticipate no more yea-and-nay votes this evening. I think Senators may be free to leave the Chamber with that understanding.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 416, House bill 7176, the general Government matters appropriation bill, with the understanding that it will not be discussed until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, House bill 6769, was reported by the committee this afternoon.

I have asked that the printed report of the subcommittee be brought to the Chamber so that any Senator who desires to do so may review it. I am informed that no change was made in the amounts contained in the subcommittee report. There was some change in language. I believe the distinguished ranking minority member is familiar with the language which was added.

I hope, before the Senate concludes its business today, that any Senator who desires to do so will ask for a copy of the subcommittee report. I am informed that copies will be available at the desk.

CONFERENCE TO REVIEW THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. SYMINGTON, a concurrent resolution dealing with world peace through world law. The proposal calls for United Nations Charter review and revision to advance the rule of law in the world community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 52

Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States is to achieve a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas there can be no such peace without the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention; and

Whereas peace does not rest on law today but on the delicate balance of terror of armed force; and

Whereas the United Nations and other international organizations constitute an important influence for peace and need to be strengthened to achieve the rule of law in the world community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at its tenth session resolved that "a general conference to review the charter shall be held at an appropriate time"; and appointed a "Committee consisting of all the members of the United Nations to consider, in consultation with the Secretary-General, the question of fixing a time and place for the Conference, and its organization and procedures"; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at its twelfth session resolved "to keep in being the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter, * * * and to request the Committee to report, with recommendations, to the General Assembly not later than at its fourteenth session"; and

Whereas the said Committee is scheduled to meet in the summer of 1959 in advance of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly to be convened in New York in September of 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States position at the forthcoming meeting of the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter should be that the Committee recommends to the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly that a charter review conference be held not later than December 31, 1962, and that member governments be requested to prepare recommendations and to exchange views with respect to United Nations Charter review and revision in order to facilitate the organization of the said conference and to further the chances of its success.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to initiate high-level studies in the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes should be made in the Charter of the United Nations, and the charters of other international organizations to which the United States is a party, to promote a just and lasting peace through the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention. The President is further requested to report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within twelve months after the date of approval to this resolution, the results of such studies.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on April 23 I submitted a substantially similar concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) on behalf of 14 other Senators and myself, and identical concurrent resolutions were submitted in the House of Representatives by a dozen Members of the other body.

Although the State Department, as expected, commented adversely on Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, and I will discuss the Department's views later, the general response to the resolution, both in this country and abroad, has been most favorable.

Just 2 weeks ago 46 members of the House of Commons, under the leadership of Arthur Henderson, sponsored a measure containing largely identical language to that set forth in Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 to urge the British Government to take a position in favor of the convening of a U.N. Charter Review Conference.

Since Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 was submitted, a number of constructive suggestions as to how the resolution could be strengthened have been made by Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., only recently president of the American Bar Association; Grenville Clark, Esq.; and Prof. Louis B. Bohn, of the Harvard Law School, who have coauthored a monumental work published last year, entitled "World Peace Through World Law"; and other interested persons and groups.

Accordingly, I am introducing at this time an amended concurrent resolution regarding U.N. Charter review on behalf of the same 14 Senators who cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself. The amended resolution is also being reintroduced today in the House by a large group of sponsors. As changed, I am confident that this measure will have the backing of the American Bar Association and its committee on world peace through law, which has taken such a commendable lead in bringing public attention to bear on the need for the development of the rule of law in international affairs.

PRELIMINARY PARAGRAPHS OF RESOLUTION

The resolution notes first that the basic purposes of U.S. foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace. This fundamental precept, declared earlier this year by the Senate when it adopted Senator HUMPHREY's resolution, Senate Resolution 96, expressing support for the Government position at Geneva in favoring an enforceable agreement to ban nuclear tests, bears reiteration by Congress, in view of the constant distortion of our aims by our adversaries.

Secondly, the resolution states that there can be no just and lasting peace without the development of the rule of law in the field of war prevention. The same premise was stated by President Eisenhower on October 31, 1956:

There can be no peace without law.

June 24, 1959

9. LAMB GRADING. Rep. Roosevelt stated that during recent hearings held by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee, the subcommittee was "surprised and alarmed" to learn that USDA "has announced its intention to consider the suspension of Federal grading of lamb and mutton carcasses effective August 1, 1959," and said that small businessmen in the industry feel this step "will be ruinous to their business." pp. 10744-5

10. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Flood inserted a statement and statistics in support of the Flood-Douglas area redevelopment bill, S. 722. pp. 10746-50

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that although the House would meet on Fri., there would be no legislation that day, that for next week the House would consider on Mon., the supplemental appropriation bill for 1960, H. R. 5752, the legal holiday bill for Federal employees, on Tues., Wed., and Thurs., House joint resolution continuing appropriations until regular appropriations bills are enacted, and that conference reports can be brought up at any time. pp. 10735, 10738

12. ADJOURNED until Fr., June 26. p. 10770

SENATE

13. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. By a vote of 79 to 2, passed as reported this bill, H. R. 7176 (pp. 10677-707). Conferees were appointed (p. 10707). House conferees have not yet been appointed.

Agreed to a committee amendment appropriating $250,000 for the use of Federal agencies, under the direction of the Budget Bureau, in improving management operations and establishing more efficient business methods in Government operations (p. 10678).

A point of order was sustained against an amendment by Sen. Douglas which would have provided that future appropriation requests for the Office of the President shall include a statement of any services or facilities proposed to be made available to the President under other appropriation accounts (pp. 10695-6).

14. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. By a vote of 84 to 10, passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 6769 (pp. 10637-8, 10641-66, 10671-2). Conferees were appointed.

A point of order by Sen. Bush was sustained striking out a provision in the bill that funds available for grants to States for area vocational education programs shall be available for instruction in programs for workers in training for occupations requiring scientific technical knowledge (p. 10661).

Rejected, 26 to 70, a motion by Sen. Dirksen to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back with a total figure not in excess of $3,691,685,581 (p. 10664).

15. FARM LABOR. Received from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom a resolution urging "a strong and positive Federal program to improve the lot of migratory farm workers." p. 10624

16. ELECTRIFICATION. At the request of Sen. Kerr H. R. 3460, the TVA self-financing bill, was recommitted to the Public Works Committee for further consideration. p. 10634

17. FORESTRY. Sen. Murray inserted an editorial, "Preserving Wilderness Is Vital to Montana," favoring enactment of legislation to preserve wilderness areas. p. 10636

18. COMMITTEE REPORTS. At the request of Sen. Johnson Senate committees were "authorized to file reports during the recess or adjournment of the Senate." p. 10672

19. MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT; TRAVEL EXPENSES. The Senate report of June 22 on H. R. 7176, the general government matters appropriation bill, includes the following statement:

"The committee agrees with the House that this program should not be reduced, in view of the beneficial results in management improvement as well as actual savings obtained from the projects that have been undertaken. The committee is advised that it is not possible to plan an orderly series of such projects and that a lack of funds might prevent the President from taking prompt action in bringing about solutions to management problems or in making needed administrative improvements in the executive branch. Accordingly, the committee recommends restoring the item to the bill, as estimated, in the amount of $250,000. Prior appropriations, since 1953, have totaled $1,200,000. With the unobligated balance, the amount recommended would provide a level of about $500,000 to begin the fiscal year.

"The committee believes that this modest cost can be expected to ultimately result in savings of substantially greater amounts in future appropriations. It is the hope of the committee that one practice which will receive attention in such a study is that of correcting the use of first-class or deluxe air transportation almost exclusively for Federal employees and military personnel traveling by air. We believe that substantial savings in the cost of Government travel could be effected by greater use of air coach and similar economy classes of air travel. Air coach travel now counts for more than 50 percent of commercial air travel, and we see no justification for the general use of a class of air transportation which is more expensive than that chosen by the average air traveler."

20. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that, beginning today, June 25, the Senate would debate H. R. 7523, to extend corporate normal-tax and certain excise-tax rates, until it is passed. p. 10707

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. INFORMATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Church inserting an editorial, "The Right To Know," and stating that it is "indicative of the growing discontent among the people of this country with the creeping concealment that has come to remove more and more areas of Government business from public view. pp. pp. A5445-6

22. POULTRY. Extension of remarks of Sen. Cotton discussing problems of the poultry farmers, stating that "the basic cause of the price decline is overproduction," and inserting testimony before the House Agriculture Committee and an editorial on this subject. pp. A5446-7

Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel inserting two articles, "And Now It's Eggs," and "Same Problem Everywhere." p. A5485

23. STOCKPILING. Extension of remarks of Sen. Church inserting a letter from the Idaho Mining Ass'n "detailing the concern" of the mining industry over the reported plans of OCDM to seek legislation to broaden its authority to dispose of stockpile minerals. pp. A5447-8

24. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Humphrey inserting an editorial, "Is the USDA Anti-Farmer?" p. A5449

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 24, 1959

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Execu-
5 tive Office of the President and sundry general Government
6 agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

4 For compensation of the President, including an expense
5 allowance at the rate of $50,000 per annum as authorized
6 by the Act of January 19, 1949 (3 U.S.C. 102), $150,000.

7 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary for The White House Office,
10 including not to exceed $215,000 for services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
12 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as
13 the President may specify, and other personal services
14 without regard to the provisions of law regulating the em-
15 ployment and compensation of persons in the Government
16 service; newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and
17 travel, and official entertainment expenses of the President,
18 to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $2,221,000.

19 SPECIAL PROJECTS

20 For expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the
21 President in connection with special projects, to be expended
22 in his discretion and without regard to such provisions of
23 law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the
24 compensation and employment of persons in the Government
25 service as he may specifiy, $1,500,000: *Provided,* That not

1 to exceed 10 per centum of this appropriation may be used
2 to reimburse the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,
3 The White House Office", for administrative services.

4 EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

5 For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refur-
6 nishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including elec-
7 tric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the
8 Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be
9 expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding
10 the provisions of this or any other Act, $475,000.

11 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget,
14 including not to exceed $110,000 for expenses of travel, and
15 not to exceed $20,000 for services as authorized by section
16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
17 not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $4,665,000.

18 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out
21 its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C.
22 1021), including newspapers and periodicals (not exceed-
23 ing $400); not exceeding $15,000 for expenses of travel;
24 and press clippings (not exceeding $300); $395,000.

1 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the National Security
4 Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
6 in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; and acceptance
7 and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services;
8 $792,000.

9 PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
10 ORGANIZATION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the President's Advisory
13 Committee on Government Organization, established by
14 Executive Order 10432 of January 24, 1953, including serv-
15 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
16 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem
17 for individuals, $57,500.

18 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

19 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT,
20 NATIONAL DEFENSE

21 For expenses necessary to enable the President, through
22 such officers or agencies of the Government as he may desig-
23 nate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding
24 the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation
25 and employment of persons in the Government service as

1 he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies
2 affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may
3 arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year,
4 $1,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
5 shall be available for allocation to finance a function or
6 project for which function or project a budget estimate of
7 appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the
8 Eighty-sixth Congress, and such appropriation denied after
9 consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Represent-
10 atives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

11 (1) *Expenses of Management Improvement*

12 *For expenses necessary to assist the President in improv-*
13 *ing the management of executive agencies and in obtaining*
14 *greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of*
15 *more efficient business methods in Government operations,*
16 *including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of*
17 *August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals*
18 *not to exceed $75 per diem, by allocation to any agency or*
19 *office in the executive branch for the conduct, under the gen-*
20 *eral direction of the Bureau of the Budget, of examinations*
21 *and appraisals of, and the development and installation of*
22 *improvements in, the organization and operations of such*
23 *agency or of other agencies in the executive branch, $250,000,*
24 *to remain available until expended, and to be available with-*

1 *out regard to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679*
2 *of the Revised Statutes, as amended.*

3 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
6 the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the
7 acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries;
8 purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national
9 cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and
10 its Territories and possessions; not to exceed $70,000 for
11 expenses of travel; rent of office and garage space in foreign
12 countries; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance
13 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
14 by law of such countries; $1,295,000: *Provided,* That where
15 station allowance has been authorized by the Department
16 of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at
17 certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be author-
18 ized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Com-
19 mission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this
20 appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of
21 such allowance: *Provided further,* That when traveling on
22 business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces
23 serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may
24 be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian mem-
25 bers of the Commission: *Provided further,* That the Com-

1 mission shall reimburse other Government agencies, includ-
2 ing the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of
3 personnel assigned to it.

4 CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

5 Not to exceed $160,000 of funds heretofore appropri-
6 ated under this head shall be available for necessary ex-
7 penses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II
8 memorials, erected under the authority of the Act of July
9 25, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 123), including travel and such other
10 purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper,
11 and such amount may be expended without regard to the
12 provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the ex-
13 penditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall
14 not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submis-
15 sion of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting
16 Office for audit): *Provided*, That, when in the discretion
17 of the head of any other Government agency it would be in
18 the public interest, personnel, services, supplies, equipment,
19 and facilities of such agency may be furnished without reim-
20 bursement to the Commission for the purposes of these dedi-
21 cations.

22 During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $5,000 of
23 funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be avail-
24 able for travel expenses (other than in connection with
25 dedications of memorials).

1 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary to carry on the activities of the
4 Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services
5 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
6 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for in-
7 dividuals; not to exceed $12,000 for expenses of travel;
8 advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies
9 for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the
10 functions of the Commission; hire of motor vehicles for field
11 use only; and employment of aliens; $458,000, of which
12 $50,000 shall be derived only from the war claims fund
13 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
14 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948) and not to be
15 available for obligation after June 30, 1960.

16 SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities
19 Control Board, including services as authorized by section
20 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to
21 exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed
22 $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals,
23 (2)~~$380,000~~ *$360,000.*

1 TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

3 SEC. 201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
4 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
5 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
6 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
7 vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed
8 at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum
9 shall be $1,950.

10 SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specified and during the cur-
11 rent fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in
12 this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation
13 of any officer or employee of the Government of the United
14 States (including any agency the majority of the stock of
15 which is owned by the Government of the United States)
16 whose post of duty is in continental United States unless
17 such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a
18 person in the service of the United States on the date of
19 enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had
20 filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the
21 United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes
22 allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from the
23 Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for

1 permanent residence: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this
2 section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be con-
3 sidered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this
4 section with respect to his status have been complied with:
5 *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit
6 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined
7 not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one
8 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause
9 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
10 provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any pay-
11 ment made to any officer or employee contrary to the
12 provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the
13 Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citi-
14 zens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of
15 those countries allied with the United States in the current
16 defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators,
17 or to temporary employment in the field service (not to
18 exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

19 SEC. 203. Appropriations of the executive departments
20 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
21 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
22 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
23 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
24 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
25 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed

1 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
2 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
3 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
4 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
5 tries: *Provided,* That the availability of appropriations made
6 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
7 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
8 hereby.

9 SEC. 204. No part of any appropriation for the current
10 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid
11 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or
12 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to
13 approve the nomination of said person.

14 SEC. 205. No part of any appropriation contained in
15 this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be
16 used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and
17 future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and
18 such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the
19 understanding that latest published cumulative annual
20 pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be
21 furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume
22 for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal
23 Digest.

24 SEC. 206. Funds made available by this or any other
25 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year

1 of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
2 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841),
3 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
4 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia;
5 services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August
6 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under
7 this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable
8 to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified
9 in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,*
10 That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative
11 expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other
12 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be
13 correspondingly reduced.

14 SEC. 207. No part of any funds of or available to any
15 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
16 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
17 purchase or construction of any office building, without
18 specific authority in law therefor, primarily for occupancy
19 by any department or agency of the United States Govern-
20 ment or by any corporation owned by the United States
21 Government.

22 SEC. 208. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of
23 July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including
24 currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may
25 be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which

1 appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including
2 the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of
3 such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made
4 to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency
5 concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange
6 allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be
7 used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar
8 items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by
9 law, without reimbursement to the Treasury: *Provided*
10 *further,* That nothing in section 1415 of the Act of
11 July 15, 1952, or in this section shall be construed
12 to prevent the making of new or the carrying out
13 of existing contracts, agreements, or executive agree-
14 ments for periods in excess of one year, in any case
15 where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements
16 for periods in excess of one year were permitted prior to the
17 enactment of this Act under section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus
18 Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1641
19 (b) (2)), and the performance of all such contracts, agree-
20 ments, or executive agreements shall be subject to the avail-
21 ability of appropriations for the purchase of credits as
22 provided by law.

23 SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation contained in
24 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
25 individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act,

1 shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed
2 to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.
3 SEC. 210. (a) Section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental
4 Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C.
5 200 (b)), is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in con-
6 nection with the submission of all requests for proposed
7 appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of
8 each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obli-
9 gations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as
10 defined in subsection (a) hereof."
11 (b) Section 1 (c) of the Act of July 25, 1956 (70
12 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701 (c)), is amended by striking the
13 words "reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supple-
14 mental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830: 31 U.S.C.
15 200 (b))."
16 SEC. 211. This Act may be cited as the "General Gov-
17 ernment Matters Appropriation Act, 1960".

Passed the House of Representatives May 27, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 24, 1959.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7176

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 24, 1959

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

when the Formosa resolution was before those committees. There was elicited in the testimony then taken what was clearly a policy proposal under that resolution which, if adopted, might very well have led us into a preventive war. The record of that hearing is a matter of history. I shall always be proud of the fact that in that hearing I took the lead in opposition to the policy expressed in the testimony of the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As a result of the debate which ensued, the chairman of the committee, who was then Senator Walter George, of Georgia, went to the White House for a conference with the President of the United States. He came back and expressed to me, in the cloakroom to my right, his great fear, too, that the United States might well become involved in a preventive war if the statements of the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had gone unchallenged.

He went to the White House, talked to the President, and got a clarification of the situation. It was then that the White House issued its famous statement that the President, and the President alone, would make the decision concerning the course of action to be followed in Asia with respect to carrying out the proposals of the Formosa doctrine.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is certainly privileged, as other Senators are privileged, to disagree with me as to why I think the policies of the Secretary of State might have led the country into a preventive war if some of us had not opposed his policies very critically from time to time.

I have always been of the opinion, and still am, that if some of us had not been willing to stand up against the original Dulles doctrine in 1955—and finally it got to just three of us on the floor of the Senate—the United States might very well have become involved in a preventive war in that year. Many persons in this country share that point of view. When I say many, there are many who have researched this matter who share that point of view.

Those of us who share that point of view represent honest, sincere, and serious differences of opinion with regard to the policies of the Secretary of State from those who supported the Secretary's policies. When I think a leader of our Government is following such a course of action I shall not hesitate to criticize him. I shall do so because I think a preventive war would be plainly immoral and inexcusable. I do not intend to speak of such a leader with hypocritical compliments on my lips.

Apparently the Senator from Arizona is averse to the use of critical and negative adjectives describing the course of conduct of a public official. But whenever I believe that a public official is not deserving of the trust of the American people, I intend to say so within my rights as a Member of this body, on and off the floor of the Senate. I express my convictions on and off the floor of the Senate and do not hide behind senatorial immunity.

I would be less than human if I did not say that I am sorry the Senator from Arizona thinks so ill of the senior Senator from Oregon. But it seems I will simply have to take comfort in the enemies I make and be judged by the enemies I make. I have no intention of changing my course of action by betraying the trust which I think I owe to the people of my State and my Nation, simply because my course of action may not be pleasing to the Senator from Arizona or to others of my colleagues in the Senate.

I am perfectly willing to be judged now, and to be judged after I am gone, by my record in the Senate, and by the fact that I shall never be afraid to call a spade a spade or to call the shots as I see them.

Of course, it would be nice to have the good will of the Senator from Arizona. But I assure the Senate that I did not ask him to make the speech he has made. However, I thank him for it. If I could have persuaded him to make it, I would have persuaded him to do so, because I would like to be judged by the opposition to me by the Senator from Arizona.

Finally and good naturedly, I wish to say that there may be something which would concern me less than the criticism of the Senator from Arizona; but if there is, I do not know what it is.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I did not make my remarks with any feeling that they would make a great impression on the senior Senator from Oregon, because I feel certain other persons have discussed with him what they feel to be the use of intemperate language.

The Senator from Oregon mentioned censure. That has been suggested. I have flatly refused to be a party to it. I voted against the censure of Senator Joe McCarthy because I think a Senator has the right to say what he wants to say. I will defend the right of the Senator from Oregon in that respect.

All I attempted to do in my remarks today was to point out the consistency of intemperateness which is characteristic of the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon. I did so in the hope that his brilliant mind and his respect for people might cause him to pause as he disagrees with the policies of others, and to consider the language in which he might express his disagreement with them.

I do not disagree with the right of the senior Senator from Oregon to disagree with John Foster Dulles, to whom he referred as "this evil man." Of course, anybody could criticize Mr. Dulles; but he was not an evil man.

My whole purpose in speaking today was to plead with the intelligence of the senior Senator from Oregon, to plead with his sense of decency, as so often expressed by his feelings about civil liberties and civil rights, so that his future choice of language might be different.

I shall not stand here and say that the language of the junior Senator from Arizona has always been temperate. I am certain I have uttered many intemperate words. I wish I could take them back. Whenever I have uttered them and have found them to be wrong or intemperate, I have tried to correct them by apologies or by statements of retraction.

The whole purpose of my remarks was to dissociate myself from the language used by the senior Senator from Oregon from time to time, because it might have been assumed that my silence meant that I agreed with what he said.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7086) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, and ask that it be stated.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is this an amendment to the general Government matters appropriation bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. The chairman of the subcommittee is not on the floor. I am not going to ask for any delay to take place, but I hope someone will contact the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He told me he wanted to be on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed the Senator from Washington is en route to the Chamber, but, at the request of the minority leader, I thought we would try to make progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator from

Wisconsin that the committee amendments should be disposed of first.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President—Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense," on page 5, after line 10, to insert:

EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

For expenses necessary to assist the President in improving the management of executive agencies and in obtaining greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of more efficient business methods in Government operations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, by allocation to any agency or office in the executive branch for the conduct, under the general direction of the Bureau of the Budget, of examinations and appraisals of, and the development and installation of improvements in, the organization and operations of such agency or of other agencies in the executive branch, $250,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available without regard to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Subversive Activities Control Board—Salaries and Expenses," on page 8, line 23, to strike out "$380,000" and insert "$360,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now open to further amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 18, to strike out "$2,221,000" and insert, in lieu thereof, "$2,136,719: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of compensation to (1) any person occupying the position of Assistant to the Deputy Assistant to the President, (2) any person occupying the position of Staff Assistant to the President, and (3) more than four Administrative Assistants to the President."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would eliminate the appropriations for five of the seven lobbying positions in the White House Office.

The taxpayer is now required to pay the salaries of lobbyists whose sole job is well known to be to sway the Congress to agree with the President. This is morally indefensible. It is also clearly illegal. It violates the lobbying code, which specifically prohibits the use of any money appropriated by Congress to be used to influence in any way the legislative action of a Member of Congress.

Here is what title 18, section 1913, of the Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure provides:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member of Congress or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Mr. President, it is clear that this law flatly, clearly, and explicitly prohibits the use of any money appropriated by the Congress to be used to influence the Congress, with two very exact and specific exceptions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill, so that all Senators may know we expect to have a vote this evening.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I repeat, it is clear that this law flatly, clearly, and explicitly prohibits the use of any money appropriated by the Congress to be used to influence the Congress, with two very exact and specific exceptions.

No. 1: Employees of the United States may communicate with Members of the Congress on the request—I repeat, on the request—of Members. That is when the Congressman takes the initiative. The initiative in the case of this exception obviously should not come from the President. This particular exception could understandably permit the one or two legislative aids that my amendment would still permit. But it is perfectly obvious, Mr. President, that the exception does not permit the kind of wholesale, aggressive, unsolicited expansion of the legislative staff to permit a kind of pressure that I shall describe later, and which has been obvious to those who have closely followed this Congress particularly.

The only other exception to the law's flat prohibition is communication to Congress through the proper official channels—I repeat, the proper official channels. This, of course, would except from the law's proscription the President's annual state of the Union message, his other, formal, publicly declared messages to Congress. It would except the proper, official channel of the congressional committees, and testimony before the committee by officials of the executive branch. But, Mr. President, if this ban against executive branch lobbying is to have any meaning at all, it cannot permit the President to use congressional appropriations to hire lobbyists to take the initiative to seek out Members of Congress privately to pressure them, for such reasons as party loyalty, to support his position against the program of the congressional majority.

Of course, the President must have staff assistance in dealing with Congress, but, as pointed out by the Wall Street Journal of a few days ago, in place of the one or two men, at the most, that Roosevelt and Truman had, Eisenhower now has six full-time envoys to Capitol Hill, plus General Persons, his chief of staff, who spends much of his time dealing with legislators.

I have offered this amendment because the President is simply setting the pace. What is happening in the big emphasis on White House lobbyists is also happening throughout the executive branch. For instance, Army and Air Force lobbyists have grown from 5 in 1940 and 65 in 1946 to 248 today.

That is about a fiftyfold increase. There are 50 times as many lobbyists representing the Army and Air Force as there were in 1940. As a matter of fact, there are some four times as many as there were in 1946, when the Army and Air Force were larger than they are today.

In fact, the total Pentagon lobbying team is 330. And it is scheduled to expand by a dozen or more this year. The Wall Street Journal recently estimated that there are 500 people in the executive branch now engaged in what is euphemistically called legislative liaison. The cost is $3.5 million every year.

This means that there are about as many legislative liaison workers as there are Congressmen. What a situation. The Congress has not grown very significantly in size in the past 10 or 20 years; but the army of legislative liaison personnel has multiplied, perhaps as much as fortyfold—4,000 percent—judging by the increase in the Army and Air Force complement. And, Mr. President, the legislative liaison corps continues to grow by leaps and bounds even in this economy-minded administration.

But the White House lobbyists are the real, partisan, major leaguers. They step in on major, Republican versus Democrat issues. Paid by the taxpayer, they push Republican Party loyalty in persuading Members of Congress to go along with the President and the Republican Party program. The President's lobbyists move in usually as the clinchers on the major policy bills.

Frankly, these lobbyists are doing well in their job of imposing the will of the White House on Congress, all things considered, and with a prominent exception or two. In fact they are doing very well, indeed. The reason for the President's ability to smother a Democratic program has mystified many. The appropriations this Congress is asked today to make to continue the President's ace lobbying staff at three times the pre-Eisenhower level is one of the reasons, and a big one, why the President has prevailed over an apparent congressional majority position. This may be fine for the President and for the Republican Party, but for the taxpayer it simply amounts to an involuntary contribution to a partisan program.

This amendment would attempt to stop the President from using the taxpayers' money to persuade Congress to accept a viewpoint which the great majority of

taxpayers rejected in the congressional elections of 1958.

Mr. President, an excellent study entitled "Ike's Lobbyists" was recently made by the Wall Street Journal. The headline reads: "Administration Enlarges Staff Assigned To Sell Programs to Congress." The subhead is "Liaison Men Write Speeches, Answer Questions, Set Up Trips, Push Party Loyalty; Annual Costs: $3.5 Million."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of these remarks this article be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objections to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the course of this article Lester Tanzer, the Wall Street Journal Reporter, describes how the lobbying operates, as follows:

> The lobbyists chief tools: Facts "presented in the right manner and at the right time," according to one administration student of the art and party loyalty. When it comes to efforts to influence legislation, liaison workers deal mostly though not exclusively, with Republicans, leaving largely to higher officials the job of selling administration programs to Democratic leaders.

This is a statement from the Wall Street Journal, quoting a statement of White House lobbyists and other lobbyists:

> You tell the Congressman, "look, here's a good bill," and you make your detailed case for the bill, explains an administration lobbyist. "You tell him the President is quite anxious to get his vote. Unless he's under strong local pressures in his district, he'll go along with you. If he sits on the fence, well, you find people who know him best or you get the Republican party leadership to work him over."

This is from the Wall Street Journal. Let me repeat that very interesting last clause:

> You get the Republican Party leadership to work him over.

This, Mr. President, is a lobbyist paid out of an appropriation of this Congress, speaking.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the most serious reason why my amendment should be adopted. We live in a constitutional democracy. The Constitution is the fundamental document on which all of our laws should be anchored.

Of all the principles which animated the authors of the Constitution, none is more evident in that ingenious document than the Separation of Powers.

The Founding Fathers knew, and Americans should never forget, that the essence of our constitutional freedom goes back to the simple principle of self-government and freedom which Aristotle perceived 2500 years ago, and for which the French apostle of constitutional freedom, Montesquieu, is principally remembered: to wit, that the same group, or agency, or man should not make the laws, then execute those laws, and interpret the laws.

If the Congress appropriates money to permit the President to hire a personal lobbying staff which can enable the President to go a long way to determine what shall be the law, this fundamental principle is obviously subverted.

And it could hardly be more clear that the Constitution of the United States has been subverted, too.

Mr. President, I read from article I section I of the Constitution:

> All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

This section is explicit and unqualified. There is no question that the Constitution gives the Senate and the House the sole power. And this is exactly what my amendment is designed to protect. For it is perfectly obvious that when the spirit and very likely the letter of the criminal code outlawing executive lobbying is violated by a sixfold increase in White House lobbyists, the appropriation measure which condones and permits the practice is an invitation to the President of the United States to exercise a very great, if indirect, legislative power.

Now, Mr. President, article II of the Constitution says what the President's power and authority shall be.

Section I of article II provides:

> The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

Mr. President, section 3 of article II states exactly where the President's ommunication with Congress should constitutionally begin and end:

> He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.

Mr. President, that is it, in toto. Now can any fair-minded person tell me that any clause, any phrase, any word could possibly countenance the appropriation of public money to permit the President to hire lobbyists to privately work his will on the Congress.

Mr. President, the entire purpose of appropriating money for this many White House lobbyists is not to permit the Congress to adopt a more enlightened foreign-aid program, one more in the public interest, but to permit the President to impose his concept of a foreign-aid program on the Congress; to permit the President's foreign-aid program, not the congressional foreign-aid program, to prevail. This amendment of mine would not touch, would not mitigate one iota, the ability of Members of the Senate and the House to get all the information they desired to arrive at a decision based on their own judgment of what was in the public interest.

This amendment would deny the President the taxpayer financed power to impose his partisan will through lobbyists on the Congress, in determining the kind of housing program we have or do not have; the kind of education program we have or do not have; the kind of Fair Labor Standard Act; the wages and hour legislation, we have or do not have; the kind of unemployment compensation and depressed areas legislation this Congress shall pass or fail to pass.

Unless we amend the appropriation bill to knock out this excessive White House lobbying, we are appropriating taxpayer's money to permit the President to write the laws of this country in violation of the Constitution, and indeed of our own authority as Senators.

Mr. President, let us be completely frank. This amendment boils down to a question of power. Shall the Congress of the United States appropriate the money to permit the President of the United States to work his will on the Congress of the United States by the employment of lobbyists to work his will, or shall the Congress maintain its own authority to hear the President's publicly expressed convictions, consider in committee the administration's position in full detail, and then employ its own constitutional power and authority to determine our laws?

Mr. President, of course this whole problem of the separation of powers has never been easy. It has always been perplexing. The Founding Fathers wisely permitted a significant degree of Presidential influence over Congress—in the veto—and the right to recommend such measures as he shall judge necessary. But they were careful to be exact in limiting Presidential legislative influence to language which cannot be stretched to include this staff of lobbyists.

I want to be reasonable about this. And I think my amendment is reasonable. It would permit the President to employ two men to work largely or almost exclusively with the Congress. And this is as many as any previous President has had in all of American history. It recognizes that, of course, the President should have his full constitutional right, liberally interpreted, to urge his will upon Congress, but it would limit such influence to, first, responding to congressional inquiries for information and, second, formal messages by the President publicly pronounced.

Of course, in addition the President is free to use the great prestige of his office to urge his program any time, any place, anywhere. But it is vitally important that it be the President, himself, who does the aggressive urging, not intermediaries paid by public funds, from appropriations by the Congress itself.

The Criminal Code is very wise in proscribing such action.

Mr. President, I want to be as fair as I can with this administration. It may well be that a main purpose of the Eisenhower legislative effort is to persuade the Congress to economize. The record on appropriations may dispute this. But let us assume it is true. The fact is well known that the army of legislative liaison men that has sprung up, taking its cue from the White House staff, is not—in this administration any more than in any other—interested in taking

Congress into cutting the appropriations of the agency they represent. No matter how economy-minded the President may be, departmental ambassadors to Congress are going to be asking more—never do they urge less—and as the record shows only too well, getting more.

If this is true in an economy-minded administration I ask my good Republican friends what would happen in an administration that talked less and perhaps even acted less for economy.

This administrative lobbying is setting a dangerous precedent, Mr. President. The time to stop it is now. The way to stop it is just where it will do the most good, symbolically and by precept, right in the office of the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written in 1950, and published in the Wisconsin State Journal, a stanch Republican newspaper in my hometown of Madison, a newspaper which has always vehemently and vigorously opposed me, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. This editorial is especially appropriate, because it denounced lobbying by the Federal bureaucracy nearly 10 years ago, before the army of lobbyists had reached the enormous size that it has now attained.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE WHO WILL NOT BE TOUCHED

There is one area of lobbying that really would bear some investigation, and subsequent regulation.

But there will be little investigation in this direction, and no strict regulation.

We refer here to the pressure tactics and propagandizing by Government agencies in behalf of their own programs.

According to Congressman John Vorys, of Ohio, our Federal publicity and public relations activities now cost taxpayers more than $100 million a year.

This tax-supported lobby works unceasingly for Federal housing, Federal power, socialized medicine, more valley authorities, and more Federal control of everything.

There are more than 3,500 Federal employees—who cost taxpayers more than a million dollars a month—engaged in selling and lobbying for and stirring up support for the programs wanted—not by the people—but by department heads and Mr. Truman. The Department of Agriculture now has 525 information specialists boosting the Brannan plan, Congressman Vorys points out. Five different agencies are lobbying and publicizing Federal housing, while over the past 10 years the Federal security agencies' bureaus have spent more than $20 million in a campaign for socialized medicine.

Congressman Vorys points out one great danger in this tax-supported Federal lobby:

"Whether the immediate purpose of Government propaganda is good or bad, the fact remains that individual liberty and free institutions cannot long survive when the vast power of government may be marshaled against the people to perpetuate a given policy or a particular group of officeholders."

Some of these tax-paid lobbyists work directly—even arrogantly—upon our Congressmen and Senators. Others work indirectly, stirring up the demand for more and more Government services out in the provinces.

Now here, in our opinion, is a lobby that should be investigated, thoroughly and completely.

Here are lobbyists who constitute an immediate threat to the taxpayer—to his freedom, his way of life, and his pocketbook.

And the not-so-funny part of it is that the taxpayer, unwillingly and unknowingly, is financing the very menace from which he now has no protection.

Will Congress do anything about this tax-supported Federal lobby?

We'll bet against it, for a very good reason: The tax-supported lobbyists now are beating their brains out, working in behalf of and stirring up a demand for Dr. Truman's political patent medicines.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the Philadelphia Record in 1947, which was also aimed at reducing lobbying by the Federal bureaucracy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record]

TODAY FEDERAL LOBBY BUSY—CONGRESS ON RUN—SOME TACTICS RAW—SIGNATURES FORGED—HOUSE CUTS RESTORED

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, May 28.—Congress, which thought it had belled the cat last year when it decreed registration of lobbyists, is now jumping timidly through a hoop in the hands of a great unregistered lobby—the Federal Government.

This Congress started out to create a brave, new world in Washington, to whittle the President's whopping $37,500 million budget down to size. It is now on the run before hundreds of pesky little pressures set up by the slick operators in Government departments.

The legislators are befuddled. The people turned last November's election into a Republican landslide largely on the issue of excessive Federal spending. Today, the same people have succumbed to the octopus lobby of the Federal agencies and are angrily shouting to their elected Representatives: "Woodman, spare that tree."

Yet it is as certain today as it was on election day that Government expenses are wickedly extravagant. It is just as certain that billions in wasteful expenditures can be carved away without hurting any genuine function of government.

It also is true, although the folks back home do not realize it, that so long as tremendous chunks of Federal coin are poured into padded payrolls, really deserving projects will never get Government help.

The Government lobby is a "honey." Nothing that the NAM, the real-estate boards, the farm bloc, or the labor organizations ever dreamed up compares with it.

There is nothing new about Federal departments and agencies lobbying for funds. Despite statutes outlawing the practice, it has been done for years with every trick in the book. But never before in history have so many worked so hard to prevent so many from being booted from the public payrolls.

They are pulling strings to have State and local governments protest on behalf of their projects. They are having the folks back home flood the legislators with letters and telegrams—just the way the utility holding companies used to do.

They furnish the ammunition, the facts, to every supporter of their cause. The skilled propagandists among them—and the Federal Government's press agents run into a couple of thousand—prepare propaganda material proving that the Government is actually undermanned. In case you have any doubt about the size of the propaganda machine which has turned on the heat, a congressional committee has figures showing that Uncle Sam spends $75 million a year to supply information.

Some of the machine's tactics have been raw. For instance, the customs service lobby prepared mimeographed letters to Congressmen urging that its funds be not reduced. These letters were carried to prominent citizens who were asked to sign and mail them.

In some instances, where enough signatures could not be obtained, the lobby forged them and mailed out the petitions itself. This has outraged many Congressmen—although it got results in the Senate, which has largely restored House cuts.

The service also discharged about 1,000 employees, with all the flourish of a circus parade, in several key port cities such as New York and Philadlephia. The idea was to convince the American public that it was having its throat cut and that smugglers were about to ruin the country.

If the full budget cuts had gone into effect immediately it would not have been necessary to fire nearly so many, the service now admits. But in any event the House-approved cuts would not have taken effect until July 1.

In small towns post offices shut down 1 or 2 days a week. It was explained that this was due to the economy drive and the folks were urged to write to their Congressman. Again it can be pointed out that the cuts do not go into effect until after July 1 and that no reduction in post office hours is to result. Could it be a coincidence that the Postmaster General is chairman of the Democratic National Committee?

There have been numerous shrewd examples of such tactics. People who should know better are being convinced that Congress—whose aim is to reduce the national debt and the high wartime tax rates—is out to wreck all the Government services.

Much of the pressure comes from new wartime functions which have an ingrained opposition to giving up the ghost, and whose personnel like it where they are now and want to stay there.

Actually, Congress is only trying to reduce a $37,500 million budget to about $32 billion or $33 billion. Anyone who thinks that will cut the heart out of Government should remember that the highest prewar budget was about $9 billion.

But with the heavy lobbyist squeeze on now, the economy bloc in the House has begun to crumble around the edges; and in the Senate many House-approved reductions are being restored.

The result is going to be that instead of saving of $4,500 million or more the public will awaken one day to the fact that the reductions have been only half that, and that they have been played for suckers by the Federal lobby.

It is still not too late to do something about it, if the awakening comes soon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I earnestly hope that this amendment will be agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 16, 1959]

ADMINISTRATION ENLARGES STAFF ASSIGNED TO SELL PROGRAMS TO CONGRESS—LIAISON MEN WRITE SPEECHES, ANSWER QUESTIONS, SET UP TRIPS, PUSH PARTY LOYALTY—ANNUAL COSTS: $3.5 MILLION

(By Lester Tanzer)

WASHINGTON.—The White House official leaned over the desk of the Midwestern Republican Congressman who had voted for an administration-opposed rural electrification bill. "We need your vote to sustain the President's veto," the Eisenhower aid argued. "This bill in itself isn't important,

but the Democrats have chosen it to see if they can establish a pattern of overriding the President's vetoes. If they can win, they'll be in a better position to override the vetoes of the big spending bills later on."

At the Old House Office Building, in a tiny third-floor room that once was a ladies' powder room, sit Navy Capt. G. S. Bullen and Marine Lt. Col. William Oliver, answering phone calls or dictating letters. The two affable officers get a steady stream of requests from lawmakers on how to handle mail from their constituents—dealing with such touchy topics as a Marine sergeant who treats junior too harshly; the failure of the Navy to serve milk to an offspring four times a day; or a sailor who wants to come home to support his financially hard-pressed family.

Twenty-four hours before one of the Federal housing agencies publicly announces a grant or loan for "urban renewal," college housing, or some other Government-aided housing program, William Henry Harrison, a former Wyoming Congressman and grandson of the 23d President, may pass the word along to interested legislators. That way, the lawmakers can tip off recipients and gain some goodwill back home.

A GROWING CORPS

The White House aid, the Naval officers, and Mr. Harrison all have something in common. They're part of a sizable though little-publicized corps of officials, spread through almost every Federal agency, whose full-time job it is to make congressional friends and influence legislation. Already some 500 people, many with Capitol Hill experience of their own, are engaged, at an annual cost of $3.5 million, in the Federal endeavor known as "congressional liaison"—and their numbers are growing steadily.

Behind the rise of this breed of Federal employee, largely a post-World War II phenomenon, lies the growth and complexity of modern Federal Government. As just one sign of that underlying fact, Congress last year enacted 1,063 new laws, compared with 940 in 1940 and less than 500 in the 66th Congress of 1919–20. "Every time Congress adds a facet to our operation," says Robert Forsythe, chief liaison officer for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "the volume of our business increases."

Though it can't be measured precisely, the work of the administration's lobbyists" plainly has an impact on the current struggle between President Eisenhower and the Democratic Congress. The envoys to Capitol Hill help shape their agencies' programs at the start of each session. They aid in preparing testimony for administration witnesses at congressional hearings. They sound out lawmakers' reactions to specific proposals and try to sell their views to fence-sitters, usually employing facts and reason or, if the target is a Republican, an appeal to party loyalty.

SOME HELP MAP STRATEGY

The congressional ambassadors also help write speeches or furnish information for sympathetic lawmakers who want to speak out for an administration measure. They may help map administration strategy once a bill nears floor action, perhaps working out compromises with key legislators when a measure is in trouble. Not long ago, one executive agency's top liaison official saw to it that enough Republican members stayed away from a Senate committee's meeting to prevent a quorum—thus delaying a vote on a particular measure until the administration could swing more support for the bill.

Not all the liaison forces' efforts are focused so directly on specific legislation. Often, these influence men drum up support for their department's policies, rather than for a particular bill. The Pentagon's congressional envoys, for example, arranged 221 air trips for one or more lawmakers in 1958 to Cape Canaveral, to the Strategic Air Command's Omaha headquarters and to other U.S. military installations around the world.

"The more we get them out," reasons Brig. Gen. William Fisher, head of the Air Force's legislative liaison division, "the better-educated decisions Congress will make."

Much of the liaison workers' time is taken up with tasks less directly linked to legislation: Answering legislators' complaints and queries, usually spurred by mail from constituents, and otherwise building goodwill among lawmakers. The lobbyists dig up answers for hundreds of thousands of letters that legislators pass on to the executive agencies each year, perhaps asking for advice on how to take advantage of a Federal program or griping about some Government activity.

ITINERARIES ARRANGED FOR LAWMAKERS

To keep lawmakers happy, the State Department's liaison staff works out complete itineraries, handling all necessary reservations, for legislators who want to travel abroad, for pleasure or business. General Services Administration officials recently came up with a two-decade-old Federal Government license plate to fill a hole in a Congressman's collection. One young lady at GSA spends most of her time calling up lawmakers to give them progress reports on Government buildings under construction in their districts. The Post Office Department's congressional envoys ask legislators for their personal views on the three top prospects, as determined by civil-service exams, for postmaster jobs in their districts.

Such little aids for Congress, to be sure, would be furnished even if Federal lobbyists never lifted a finger for an administration bill. Nevertheless, there's a distinct connection between providing these services and influencing legislation. "You do a good job handling the personal problems and requests of a Congressman," a White House official figures, "and you have an easier time convincing him to back your program."

Actually, the heaviest wooing of lawmakers on behalf of administration programs is probably done by Cabinet members and other high officials, rather than the full-time lobbyists. Liaison men often call in their superiors when an especially influential legislator complains about something or a rank-and-file lawmaker raises a major policy question. Comments an Interior Department liaison official, "It's more discreet to send somebody on the policy level than one of us from the working gang."

Besides his weeky meetings with GOP leaders, the President meets privately on occasion with key lawmakers of both parties to make a more personal appeal for a particular program. On the eve of a big vote, he'll place a number of private phone calls to try to sway undecided legislators. Cabinet members, too, phone fence-sitters before a bill comes to a vote, even if the issue doesn't involve their own field; usually, the Cabinet officials concentrate on legislators from their home States or those they know well.

ANDERSON'S LUNCHEONS

Just about every Cabinet member makes a practice of meeting informally from time to time with lawmakers who deal in legislation they're concerned with. Treasury Secretary Anderson held a series of four buffet luncheons in his private dining room earlier this year—at his own expense—to explain the Treasury's debt management problems to freshman legislators and members of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees. Mr. Eisenhower recently invited Republican members of the House Commerce Committee for late-afternoon drinks at the White House to express his personal appreciation for trimming a Democratic-sponsored airport construction measure.

For all this high-level lobbying, it's the regular congressional liaison officials who cement the administration's day-to-day relations with Capitol Hill. In many cases, it's the liaison workers who spot the targets for their superiors and advise them how to handle lawmakers. William Macomber, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, for instance, may remind Secretary of State Herter he'll be seeing a key lawmaker at an evening social affair and suggest something to tell him. Mr. Macomber is sure to set up private briefings by Mr. Herter for members of the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees when the Secretary of State returns from the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva.

Attempts by the executive branch of Government to influence Congress, of course, are as old as the country itself; back in 1781, Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne's Pennsylvania regiments started marching on Congress in Philadelphia until the lawmakers agreed to make up the soldiers' back pay and discharge troops who had served their full 3-year enlistment terms. But until rather recently, "congressional liaison" was just another job of administration officials—often the general counsel of a department—who had many other duties as well. This meant the wooing of Congress usually was handled haphazardly or in routine fashion.

But in recent years, congressional liaison has become more and more formal. In 1949, for example, Congress officially created the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. Mr. Macomber, who now occupies that spot, has a 22-man staff that does nothing but deal with Congress. Before 1949, the Department's top officers had personal aides who handled their bosses' relations with Congress as well as other chores, without necessarily coordinating their efforts; "homeless wanderers," one official calls them.

LARGER LIAISON STAFFS

As the Federal Government has grown, the size of liaison staffs has increased. At the outset of World War II, the Army, which then included the Air Force, employed only five full-time lobbyists. By the end of the war, the number had soared to 65. At last count, the Army and Air Force together employed 238 legislative liaison workers. Frankiin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, who were their own chief lobbyists, had only one or two White House aids whose sole job it was to sway Congress. Mr. Eisenhower now has six full-time envoys to Capitol Hill plus Gen. Wilton (Jerry) Persons, his Chief of Staff, who spends much of his time dealing with lawmakers.

The total number of people trying to improve the administration's relations with Congress is still going up. The Pentagon's legislative liaison force, the biggest in Government at 330, is scheduled to expand by a dozen or more in the next year; spending will increase from $2.6 million in the fiscal year coming to an end June 30 to $2.9 million in fiscal 1960. The three-member staff at the recently created National Aeronautics and Space Administration will shortly go up to six. Just the other day, the staid old Interstate Commerce Commission set up the first congressional liaison office in its 72-year history.

The apparently irresitible impulse to expand doesn't stem just from the administration's desire to sway Congress. The lawmakers themselves have had a considerable hand in the steady growth of legislative liaison, with their persistent demands for information or help in handling their mail. "When Congress becomes aware of the existence of a legislative liaison office," notes an administration lobbyist, "it's amazing the way your workload increases."

Congress played a major role in the recent creation of the ICC's three-member

liaison staff. After the recent House investigation of pressures on regulatory agencies, according to one high official, many lawmakers became leery of direct contact with ICC commissioners, even on routine questions from constituents on matters pending before the Commission. So the legislators prodded the Commission into creating a sort of "middleman" to handle such matters, and thus forestall possible complaints that they were trying to influence the ICC improperly.

Congress' own urge to have executive-branch liaison workers handy probably accounts in large measure for the lawmakers' generous interpretation of laws designed to prevent use of appropriations "directly or indirectly" for administration lobbying.

But the lawmakers do occasionally snap back at the executive branch. Last year Congress forced a cutback to 330 from 360 in the number of Pentagon liaison staffers, out of resentment against the services' intensive lobbyment reorganization bill. But the size of the Pentagon staff is creeping back up again. And the lawmakers show little disposition to question the liaison activities of other Federal agencies.

No two administration agencies handle their congressional liaison exactly alike. In size, the executive departments' lobbying forces range from the Treasury's lone liaison hand—former Columbia College football all-American, Gene Rossides—to the Pentagon's seven platoons of manpower. Some agencies with large staffs, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Veterans' Administration, and the Civil Service Commission, have offices right on Capitol Hill—paid for by Congress—to provide quick access to lawmakers.

For all the diversity, a pattern of operation is clearly discernible throughout the administration * * * old congressional committee hands, including George Moore, once chief counsel of the House Post Office panel, and a large number of people who used to work for one lawmaker or another. Lawyers without such political background are numerous, too. Less typically, there's even a car dealer among the administration's legislative contact men—George Vaughan, who ran a Buick agency in Los Angeles before taking over the Defense Department's legislative affairs office earlier this year.

Personality, as well as experience, is a major factor in selecting a man for liaison work. "We run a low-key operation with no high-pressure types or brash personalities," claims a White House lobbyist. The Air Force's Brigadier General Fisher describes a typical liaison aide this way: "He has a combat record, which inspires confidence among Congressmen. He needs good judgment in dealing with people and a friendly personality, so he can handle difficult situations. He's got to be able to say 'no' pleasantly."

OBJECT: A FRIENDLY ATMOSPHERE

The idea, of course, is to create a friendly atmosphere between the administration and Congress; at the least, that can make the basic tools of the liaison staffers work more effectively. The lobbyists' chief tools: Facts "presented in the right manner and at the right time," according to one administration student of the art, and party loyalty. When it comes to efforts to influence legislation, liaison workers deal mostly, though not exclusively, with Republicans, leaving largely to higher officials the job of selling administration programs to Democratic leaders.

"You tell the Congressman, 'Look, here's a good bill,' and you make your detailed case for the bill," explains one administration lobbyist. "You tell him the President is quite anxious to get his vote. Unless he's under strong local pressures in his district, he'll go along with you. If he sits on the fence, well, you find people who know him best or you get the Republican Party leadership to work him over."

There are, of course, various ways of getting facts across to a legislator. "Your approach varies with the individual," notes a liaison official now trying to get the House to toughen the Senate-passed labor reform measure. Listen to his distinctions: "If you're talking to an old Eisenhower Republican, who may be somewhat liberal, you ask for support of the President rather than your legislation. If it's a real conservative, who wants an even stronger bill, you point out what your bill has that he wants and play down Eisenhower. If you find a guy 100 percent for you, then you use him to keep open your lines of communication with both extremes in case you have to work out a compromise."

The State Department, for one, likes to be sure it knows how various lawmakers feel about issues it's involved in. So a lady on the agency's 22-member liaison staff spends almost all her time keeping an up-to-date file on legislators, clipping newspaper reports of their votes on diplomatic issues and all their speeches, in Congress and out, on foreign matters.

LOCALIZING ARGUMENTS

Whenever they can, administration influence men like to bring their facts home to their targets. A case that is regarded as a classic among administration lobbyists was the Commerce Department's breakdown of what last year's reciprocal trade extension bill meant to individual States and districts. Such reports were furnished to 170 lawmakers who requested them; they showed among other things, the firms in a given area and the number of their employees making goods sold abroad—all of whom would supposedly benefit from extension of the trade act.

From all the outward signs, there's little evidence that any high-pressure tactics are employed—at least by the liaison men. "You occasionally hear humors of deals to get a keyman on your side," admits one congressional contact man, "but if that happens, it's handled at a higher level than mine."

Nevertheless, a lawmaker's desire to get a friend a Federal job or get a military base built in his district is often a help to the liaison man. "I never went up to a guy and said, 'Vote this way and get a job for your constituent,'" says an administration lobbyist, adding, "but you've got the basic laws of human nature on your side. If the fellow wants a favor, he's likely to vote your way just in case he thinks it might do him good."

The mere presence of a White House lobbyist on behalf of a bill stamps it as a major issue; Mr. Eisenhower's own ambassadors to Congress step in on only the most vital measures—including almost all the major spending bills this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] intends to make a preliminary statement on the bill; and, if not, if he will permit me to ask some questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the debate on the bill started when I was on my way over from the office. I think there should be a preliminary statement. I have a brief statement to present.

Mr. President, the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1960—H.R. 7176—contains funds for the Executive Office of the President, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, as well as funds appropriated to the President for the emergency fund and for expenses of management improvement, and for expenses of the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As reported to the Senate, the bill totals $13,568,500, which is $230,000 over the House bill and $40,000 under the budget estimates.

Two amendments are recommended. One amendment inserts $250,000 for expenses of management improvement in the Executive Office, to bring that fund up to about $500,000. The fund is used to study and bring about solutions to management problems or in making needed administrative improvements in the executive branch. For example, the committee has suggested a study to correct the practice of using first-class or deluxe air transportation almost exclusively for Federal employees and military personnel traveling by air, when travel by air coach represents more than 50 percent of commercial air travel.

The other amendment recommended is an additional reduction of $20,000 from funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board, due to a decrease in their workload.

I ask that the bill be read for amendments.

I now yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the very able senior Senator from Washington would be willing to answer some questions which have arisen in my mind about the budget of the President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly. First, I should like to say that the House held lengthy hearings on this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have the printed hearings of the House and I have studied them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to state the action of the Senate committee. Inasmuch as there was no appeal from the House allowance, the Senate committee did not hear any testimony on this subject, because no one asked to appear, and we accepted the House figure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Does not the President receive a salary of $100,000 a year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Plus an expense allowance of $50,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I might add that he is not accountable to anyone for the $50,000. No itemization is required.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In addition, does not the President live in an executive mansion, the White House, for which an appropriation of $475,000 for maintenance and operation is requested by the administration?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; and that is a part of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not this appropriation for the Executive Mansion include an allowance for travel expenses, as well as certain entertainment expenses?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. It does not include an allowance for travel expenses

as such. It includes an allowance for transportation of things, rather than of persons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the amount for travel expenses of the President $40,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; $40,000 is in the White House Office.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In addition to the $150,000 allowance for salary and expenses, and $475,000 for the mansion, does not the President request, in this appropriation bill, $2,221,000 for salaries and expenses for his White House offices?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In addition to the $150,000 for salary and expenses, $475,000 for the mansion, and $2,221,000 for his office, does not the President request $1,500,000 for the rather ephemeral category initiated in the fiscal year 1956, known as special projects?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have gone over the House hearings very thoroughly. I have also read articles by a number of very able reporters. In an article in the Washington Daily News by Mr. Ed Koterba, there appears the statement that in 1938, the First Lady had five maids, and that today there are eight maids. Does the Senator know whether that is correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I could not answer as to the number of persons involved. I have only the amount of money spent. Whether that would cover eight maids or five maids, I do not know. I can say to the Senator from Illinois that there has been an increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those are the facts, as shown on page 132 of the House hearings. There were five maids in 1938, and eight maids are requested for 1960.

So far as the gardeners are concerned the record shows that there were five gardeners in 1938, while 12 gardeners are requested for 1960.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of any increase in the extent of the White House lawn and gardens during these last 22 years which would require the services of additional gardeners?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not aware of any increase in the acreage. The fence has not been moved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the installation of the putting green require additional gardeners service?

Mr. MAGNUSON. A putting green lawn must be well kept.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator think this might account for a portion of the incerase from 5 to 12 gardeners?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That I do not know. I believe the House hearings contain something on that subject. I shall furnish the page reference for the RECORD. There was some extra work because of certain changes in the lawn. It is page 132.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Washington aware of the fact that on page 128 of the House hearings it is shown that in 1952 the White House staff was given as 261, and that 373 are requested for 1960?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Beginning on page 127 of the House hearings, there are comparative cost data on the Presidency and functions relating thereto, for the fiscal years 1938 to 1960, the figures for which have been collected by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has been an increase of 112 from 1952 to the requested number for 1960. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is an increase of more than 40 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. As shown on page 133 of the House hearings, 45 persons were employed in 1938. Then the number went up and up. In 1942, there were 63. In 1960 there will be 272, in the White House office proper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, there are many times the number of persons employed in the White House than there were during the days preceding and during the great World War, when the responsibilities upon the Chief Executive were very heavy indeed. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Except that during the war period, I believe the record ought to show that employees could be detailed to the White House. The agencies from which they were detailed would pay those employees. That was only during the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In 1938 there were 45.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1940 there were 63.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that there are now more than four times as many as it 1940, under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator from Washington respond to my question that, in addition to the $150,000 for salary and expenses, and $475,000 for the mansion, and $2,221,000 for Office of the President, the President has requested $1,500,000 for the rather ephemeral category first initiated in 1956 and known as special projects?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. In 1956 that appropriation began at $1,250,000. For various years since then it has gone up, until this year the figure is $1,500,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This was first asked for in 1956.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not in 1952?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; in 1956.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The supporting figures for this item are found on page 126 of House hearings. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the White House office includes a cost of $1,500,000 for special projects or a total of $3,721,000 for the White House office, exclusive of the President's $150,000 for salary and expenses, and not counting the $475,000 for maintaining the mansion. When these items are added the total is $4,346,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I not correct in assuming that the $4,346,000 is only for the President's mansion and office, and does not include another $1,055,000 for the White House Police?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The White House Police are under the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Secret Service?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course the amount stated does not include a great many other expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These are the police at the grounds?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not the Secret Service?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But charged to the Treasury, is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Charged to the Treasury; yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It comes to a total of $1,055,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. These are not the ones who go out into the country. They stay right there on the grounds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 128 of the House hearings the statement is made that the cost of the White House Police is $1,055,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that in 1938 the then President had 60 police and secret service agents to guard him, and that now the President has 160 agents and police and is asking for 170 for the 1960 budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That figure, I believe, is correct. The Legislative Reference Service pointed that out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is shown at page 135 of the House hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They say the amount is seven times the $150,650 provided in 1938, and nearly twice the $652,000 voted in 1952.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the personnel is almost three times the number of 1938. It is shown that even during the war years, when the President was probably exposed to more danger than now, the numbers were respectively 100, 94, 92, and 98.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course there may have been some other people assigned to such work during the war. That I do not know. I do not have those figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in the observation that even the total just given does not include the $395,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a separate item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not include the $792,000 for the National Security Council and other sundry items of expense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a separate item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it correct to say that both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees granted these amounts at the President's request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the $3,721,000 requested for the White House itself represents an increase of $169,230 over last year's appropriation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the increase from last year for the Mansion itself is $25,600?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For the Bureau of the Budget, $114,000 over last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For the Council of Economic Advisers, $7,000 over last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For the National Security Council, $32,600 over last year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, I should like to invite special attention to the next question which I shall ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, so that I may be meticulously accurate. For example, does the appropriation bill include the cost of purchasing and maintaining and operating the superconstellation airplane used by the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The information which has been obtained from the Bureau of the Budget, which has been put into the RECORD, and which we discussed somewhat in marking up the bill, is as follows: Mr. Stans, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated:

The only aircraft assigned for White House usage is one USAF C–121–E Super Constellation (*The Columbine*). However, it is not used exclusively by the President but has been used on occasion for the travel of the Secretary of State and high foreign dignitaries during official visits to the United States.

The flight crew of the C–121–E assigned to the White House consists of three officers, two warrant officers, four airmen. There are 8 airmen assigned as security guards and 11 airmen assigned as maintenance crew.

That amounts to 28 persons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those expenses are charged to what agency?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will come to that.

Mr. Stans continues:

Total operating cost for the *Columbine* is $198 per flying hour. This is a direct operating cost and includes petrolcum and its products, $88.67; crew, temporary duty, $4.50; and base pay for flight crew, $104.83.

The total flying hours logged for C–121–E (*Columbine*) for fiscal year 1958 was 412 hours. The total direct operating cost is therefore $81,576. This does not include the pay of the 8 guards or 11 maintenance men.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the material prepared by the Library of Congress, appearing at page 128 of the House hearings, it is stated that the Air Force reports that the cost-per-hour of running this Super Constellation is approximately $711.

Mr. MAGNUSON. An hour?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be arrived at if we add the cost of the pay of those assigned to it. This is the testimony given by Director Stans, of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In addition to the *Columbine* the President has the use of two six passenger Aero-Commanders, costing $75,000 each. They are available for shorter trips, and they are furnished by the Air Force on short notice.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has informed me that the President, over a brief period, used a two-engine Aero-Commander plane for short-range, limited facility use. This plane was supplied from the special air missions group of the Air Force.

The President has, for the past 6 years, had access to smaller planes as needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have heard much about helicopters. Is it correct that the President has available for his use two helicopters?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I have that figure here. I read from page 143 of the House hearings:

There are three jet transports now on order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will come to that in a minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

There are no helicopters specifically assigned to the President. When he requires helicopter transportation, it is requested from Army and Marine units in the local area. The Marine Helicopter Squadron is at the Marine Corps Air Station, Quantico; the Army unit is at Davison Army Air Field at Fort Belvoir. These units are stationed in the area for other missions and perform the small additional task of making occasional flights for the President. The type of helicopter which the President uses is the Sikorsky S–58 which is known as the HUS–1 by the Marines, and the H–34 by the Army. Operating costs for these helicopters, including fuel, crewing, maintcnance, and depreciation, are $350 per hour.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Also, the President has a Super Constellation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I continue to read:

Since the President's first flight in these helicopters (Sept. 7, 1957), he has accumulated 21 hours, which would be a total cost of $7,350. (This is exclusive of the cost of operating the helicopters, which the President used during his campaign trip in October 1958, which were paid for by the Republican National Committee.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. I read in the press from time to time that the helicopters are used on Friday afternoons, frequently, for trips to Gettysburg.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee will inquire about that. I do not think the statement I have just quoted is correct, namely:

These units are stationed in the area for other missions.

The Senator from Illinois knows that when the White House suggests that the President might wish to use a helicopter, the Marine Corps will keep it handy for use at any time the President wants it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If he wants it, it will be there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; it will be there. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has spoken of three Boeing 707 jet airliners made in the city from which the distinguished Senator from Washington comes, the city of Seattle. This has interested all of us. May I ask to what agency are these jet airliners charged? I do not see any provision for them in the White House budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are charged to the Air Force, and they are assigned to a special air mission group. These airplanes are military versions or transport versions of the Boeing 707. The aircraft were not ordered for any one individual or special group. But the Senator from Illinois and I know that they were designed for a special purpose.

According to the information supplied by the Bureau of the Budget:

They will take their place in the SAM fleet as replacements for Lockheed Constellation-type aircraft.

The Air Force provided in the fiscal year 1958 program for three VC–137 jet transports at $4.7 million flyaway cost each for a total flyaway cost of $14.1 million. Direct operating cost is estimated at $270.86 per flying hour. This figure includes POL $223.06, crew TDY $4, base pay of flight crew, $43.80.

The SAM mission is to provide expeditious air transportation for high-ranking U.S. Government officials conducting official business throughout the world. Invited foreign dignitaries and heads of state are also provided SAM service while in guest status. In the past, SAM planes have carried the President, Vice President, visiting dignitaries, the Secretary of State, Cabinet officers and their deputies, Members of Congress, and officials of the Department of Defense.

I do not know of any Senators who have had a ride in them; but this is the general purpose of the planes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do these planes cost approximately $4,700,000 apiece?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the flyaway cost. Probably they cost well over $5,500,000 before everything is finished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have talked with service personnel who are stationed where these planes are located. They have looked into the planes, but they have not been permitted to photograph them. However, their description of them is that they are extremely plush.

On Monday, April 27, 1959, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an article describing the new jet planes. The article describes some of the features. I read from the article:

The ship is 144½ feet long and 130 feet 10 inches from wingtip to wingtip.

Behind the cockpit is a 15-foot section containing a galley, lavatory, coat closet, and communications facilities. Next comes a 10-foot forward seating section with eight seats.

Then the President's section—most luxurious in the plane.

Two felt-covered tables at one end are flanked on each side by big, comfortable chairs. Beside the President's seat are a telephone and buttons which bring in the pilot, attendants, or communications operator on the intercom loudspeaker system.

An AM–FM radio and tape recorder are behind the table opposite the President.

At the other end of the 20-foot section are two lounges which pull out and convert into double beds. There are no berths. Jets travel so fast sleeping accommodations seldom are needed.

Light floods the compartment from a long panel overhead. A golden maize rug covers the floor—

Apparently, rugs are popular both down there and here on the Hill—

Bulkhead panels are of simulated-wood plastic. Upholstery is of rich, nubby fabric in a plain light blue and creamy beige tweed.

To the rear is the largest seating section, 32 feet, with 28 seats in double row. Upholstery here is of slightly plainer metallic tweed with a pattern of brown, aqua, blue, and white thread.

Farthest aft is an 18-foot section holding three stainless steel galleys, more coat closets, two lavatories, and the rear entry door.

I skip a paragraph:

All walls are of cream plastic with a silk screen pattern portraying buildings and landmarks from all parts of the world. Drapes are beige. All materials are fireproof.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois mind reading louder, so that we can all hear him?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I repeat:

All walls are of cream plastic with a silk screen pattern portraying buildings and landmarks from all parts of the world. Drapes are beige. All materials are fireproof.

Has the Senator from Washington seen that article?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I have not seen the article.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he seen the plane?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I have not seen the plane. I have seen versions of the Boeing 707, but I have never seen this plane.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The plane was described as I have said in the article published by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 27. On Wednesday, June 3, 1959, the New York Times published a small news item from Washington entitled "Presidential Plane in Capital." The article reads:

The Government has received two of the three Boeing VC-137 jet transports ordered for President Eisenhower and other high officials. The second transport landed at nearby Andrews Air Force Base, Md., late last week after a flight from the Seattle, Wash., plant of the Boeing Airplane Co., the Air Force said Monday.

Do I understand that these expenses are charged to the Air Force?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are charged to the Air Force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. During the winter, when it was said that this item was to be covered in a special appropriation bill, we all, of course, looked for these items in the current budget. We did not find them. Now we find that, apparently, provision was made for them in items in the budget of last year or previous years, but not specially designated as being for Executive use. Is that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as I know, that is true. I think they were provided in the general defense budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But did the American people know the planes were for executive use?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The senior Senator from Washington has no knowledge of that. I assume the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations appropriated X dollars for X number of planes, and that the planes were then set aside and fixed up in the manner which has been described.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a rumor that in addition to these 3 planes, there are 17 planes, only slightly less luxurious, which are to be used for high-ranking officers in the Department of Defense, at a cost of approximately $3 million for each plane. Has the Senator heard of those 17 planes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only planes I know of, which are included in the Department of Defense budget, and which are at all similar to the ones to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, are planes for purely military operations and training. They are small jets, but not for use by any dignitaries. In other words, the group they have set up, which is called the SAM—special air missions—is apparently the group that will provide transportation for the high-ranking Government officials; and that is where these planes were assigned.

But the planes included in the Defense budget proper are only for training. I suppose some generals and high-ranking Defense officials ride in them; but that would be only on a mission or in the field, or something of that kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may be too late to attempt to take steps in regard to the 3 luxurious planes for the White House; but I hope the matter of the alleged 17 planes for high-ranking officers in the Defense Department will be thoroughly examined.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense will do so.

I am generally familiar with some small jet planes which will be used mainly for training. But they could be used for so-called executive use. However, they are mainly for training, since it is cheaper to train in those planes, because of their reduced cost of operation, than to use the 707's or the B-52's.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield briefly to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a budget figure and a request for planes of the nature the Senator from Washington is discussing—in three categories.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Seventeen of them?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly more than that. But all of them are for training and for use for airlifts.

Of course an officer can ride in a plane that is carrying nothing but equipment.

But the budget includes some planes for the training of navigators—which is just as important in connection with the national defense as it is to train pilots. Others are for the traiing of the pilots themselves. The ordinary pilot who is trained to handle the regular, conventional planes is not likely to be the proper pilot—unless he has further training—for the present-day jets.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are these planes used primarily for high-ranking officers—those of flag rank?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not be at all surprised to find that high-ranking military officers and high-ranking departmental civilian officials use them. But that is not the purpose of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator ever examined the logs which list the names of those who have used these planes; or have the investigators for the committee ever asked for the logs?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have investigated a great deal, because I am just as anxious as anyone else is to have these planes used for the purposes for which they were provided. However, there is no doubt in my mind that some military officer of high rank can ride in those planes. I am quite sure that in the past there has been a great deal of abuse in that connection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Mexico say there has been a great deal of abuse?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; there has been. I can say that for several years such planes were used to take trips to shoot pheasants in South Dakota. But that is not being done now. The Congress—both the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses—is insisting that the planes be used for the purposes for which the money was provided.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they are not covered by this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator from Washington tell me how much larger the appropriations for the White House are than the appropriations for the same purpose during the last year when Mr. Truman was President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The fiscal year 1952 was the last year when Mr. Truman was President. To break down the items by categories: In the fiscal year 1952, the appropriations for personal services were $1,367,000. The estimate for the fiscal year 1960 is $1,947,000—or an increase of approximately $600,000, or approximately 50 percent more, for personal services.

Since approximately 1940, the travel expense appropriation for all the Presidents has been about the same—$38,000 or $40,000.

The appropriation for communications services has increased to an estimated $50,000 for 1960, as compared to $32,000 in 1951.

The appropriation for rent and utilities is about the same.

The appropriation for printing has increased considerably. In 1938, the appropriation for printing was $2,183; and now it is over $30,000.

The appropriation for supplies and materials has increased.

The appropriations for the office of the President in 1951—the last year when Mr. Truman was President—came to a total of $1,495,000; and for the fiscal year 1960 they will be $2,221,000. That total does not include——

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not include the $1,500,000 for "special projects"; does it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; and it does not include some of the other items we have been discussing. But that is an increase of approximately 60 percent, in rough figures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not explain why the increase was needed? In that connection, why not mention the increase in pay?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not yet come to that. I have stated only the rough figures.

The appropriation for personal services would be, in part, for some pay increases, but they would not amount to 60 percent, in the case of the normal

services around the White House. They would amount to approximately 30 to 40 percent in the case of some of the assistants to the President.

Mr. LANGER. I am interested in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. If I have a chance to vote for that amendment, I shall do so, for I think what it proposes is long overdue.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House Appropriations Committee has included in the hearings the figures for pay increases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But is it not true that since 1952 there has been a decrease in the number of persons employed there? Is it not true that today there are 100 less persons on the executive payroll than the number on the executive payroll on June 30, 1952? There are 100 fewer persons, because in arriving at the figures it is necessary to exclude the employees in the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. All our figures——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have prepared figures on this point.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am prepared to state the correct figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have the floor; but I shall be glad to yield. All those figures are set forth in the House committee hearings.

Mr. ALLOTT. In 1952, the number was 1,504. The estimated number for the fiscal year 1960 is 1,404.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not see how that could be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The material which I have before me in the House hearings beginning on page 138 was actually prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, although it was improperly designated, in printing it, as coming from the Library of Congress. A grave error was made in preparing the figures for 1952—by including those for the National Security Resources Board and those for the Office of Defense Mobilization. But the number of comparable positions was subtracted from the 1960 estimate.

The true figures show there has been an increase of 262, in comparable units, over this period of time.

That error was made by the Bureau of the Budget.

I ask unanimous consent that a correct table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of personnel in the Executive Office of the President, 1952 and 1960

Item	1952	1960	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
President	1	1	--------
White House Office	261	272	+11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	72	+1
White House Police	170	170	--------
Bureau of the Budget	515	435	−80
Council of Economic Advisers	47	31	−16
Emergency Fund for the President	82	5	−77
National Security Council	23	77	+54
National Security Resources Board	135	-------	−135
Office of Defense Mobilization	199	-------	−199
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,175	1,768	+593
Special projects	-------	101	+101
President's Advisory Committee on Government Operations	-------	5	+5
President's Committee on Fund Raising in the Federal Service	-------	4	+4
Total	2,679	2,941	+262

Mr. DOUGLAS. This table is taken from the House hearings on this bill, page 199. However, to make it comparable, I have added to the number of positions under President Truman the figure of 1,175 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration for the year 1952 which, when added to those at the ODM and National Security Resources Board in 1952, is a comparable figure with the 1,768 positions under the new Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in 1960. Thus, I have bent over backward to make this a fair comparison and one which compares the actual functions in the Executive Office in 1960 with those same functions—in or out of the Executive Office—in 1952. Here, too, then is a place where the President could begin to practice what he preaches.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All the figures we have are from the House committee hearings. They were given to us by the Bureau of the Budget. Those are the figures I am quoting. But I do not think anyone would say that the cost of maintaining the White House has decreased. It has increased. There may be good reasons for it, but it has gone up considerably, and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has detailed it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question addressed to the Senator from Washington by Members on the other side of the aisle have been directed primarily to the Executive Office of the President, but not the White House Office. The White House Office, as it is very clearly stated on page 128 of the House hearings, has had an increase in personnel of from 261 to 373, or an increase of 112.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Actually, if the Senator will look at page 133, in 1938 the White House Office appropriation was $211,380, and the number of people employed was 45.

For the Executive Mansion and grounds, the appropriation in 1938 was $210,098, and the number of people employed was 57.

The number of White House police employed was 60, at a cost of $150,650.

The White House Office appropriation increased from $211,000 in 1938 to $1,883,615 in 1952, and the number of positions increased from 45 in 1938 to 261 in 1952.

For the Executive Mansion and grounds, the number of positions increased from 57 in 1938 to 71 in 1952.

For 1960 the requested number of positions is 72.

In other words, the totals for the White House in 1938 were 162 persons and an appropriation of $647,128. In 1952 the appropriation was $3,021,215, and 502 persons were employed.

For 1960 the requested appropriation is $5,401,000, with a total number of 615 persons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the increase of 112 to which the Senator from Illinois has been calling attention, and the concentration of 112 is in the White House office, the increase for the Executive Mansion and grounds being only 1, and the number of White House Police being constant.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the appropriation bill and the items to which we have thus far referred include the cost of purchasing, maintaining, and operating the automobiles and limousines used by the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. That is in a separate item. I am not quite clear as to the method by which that expense is included in appropriation bills, but I know that item is not included in this cost; the cars are leased. I do not know who pays the bill for the leasing——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say I think the leases are handled under the item of "other contractual services."

Mr. MAGNUSON. The cost is paid out of that item, but there is no initial payment made. It is a leasing arrangement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the report of the Library of Congress prepared for the House committee, which appears on page 129 of the House hearings, at the top of the page it is stated:

> It is reported that at least 20 cars are rented on a regular basis for use by the President and his staff. Additional vehicles are made available when the need arises. The President is reported to use three cars: A recent-model Cadillac, a bubbletop Lincoln costing about $30,000, and a Chrysler Imperial equipped with a sliding roof. Two heavily constructed Cadillacs costing about $65,000 each are occupied by Secret Service men who accompany the President. The Army furnishes chauffeurs for this fleet of cars.

Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Army furnishes chauffeurs. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So these items are charged to the Army budget, and not to the White House office?

Mr. MAGNUSON. And, in addition, the executive office can call on a motor pool.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand it has a pool of 20 cars of its own.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I made an inquiry into this matter. I am simply going into the question of limousines. I found the White House had eight limousines, and that there were two, in addition, for the Secret Service. So there was a total of 10 limousines at the White House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not have any details on the number of cars, but I assume the figures the Senator is citing are correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does this bill include an appropriation for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels used by the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. The cost of the naval vessels is computed separately. It will be recalled that the President in 1952, when he took office, deplored the fact that the *Williamsburg* was available.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The administration used it for a time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The President declared that it was an unnecessary expense and the ship ought to be put away. The *Williamsburg* has been put away. It is now in the reserve fleet as a gunboat. In the place of the *Williamsburg* we now find being used the *Barbara Ann* and the *Susie E*, the names of the vessels having been changed from the *Leonore* and the *Margie*. The *Leonore* used to escort the *Williamsburg*, and the *Margie* was used for the President's family.

During the fiscal year 1958 the *Barbara Ann* was under way 197 hours, and the *Susie E* was used only 29 hours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Twenty-nine hours? That seems to be a very small amount of use.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

The *Barbara Ann* has one officer and eight enlisted men assigned to it. The *Susie E* crew comprises one officer and five enlisted men. Because these boats, however, are not used simultaneously, a separate crew is not maintained for the *Susie E*, but it is supplied a crew as needed from the crew of the *Barbara Ann*.

For the fiscal year 1958, the following hours were logged for the President and family and Cabinet officers, to whom the *Susie E* is made available in the month of June. This is the month when Cabinet officers can use the *Susie E*.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a consolation that on the hot nights when the rest of us are sweltering, to know that the Cabinet officers can enjoy the cool breezes of the Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac River. That will undoubtedly contribute to their peace of mind and improve their operating efficiency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With reference to the cost of operating the two boats, I do not have the exact figures, but there is one figure of $60,000——

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will yield, the Library of Congress has furnished a figure, which appears on page 129 of the House hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it a different figure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is stated on that page of the hearings that the 92-foot *Barbara Ann* cost about $140,000 to recondition, and the 60-foot *Susie E* about $35,000. The report goes on to state that there is no data on operating costs from either the Navy Department or the White House, indicating it had asked for that information, but had been unable to obtain it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the Navy uses $60,000 each year for their maintenance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The U.S. News & World Report, in 1957, estimated it would take at least $500,000 to duplicate those vessels today. So the enjoyment of the water has not been completely given up by this administration. It has not been abandoned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Washington inform me whether the bill contains an appropriation for the maintenance and operation of Camp David, the President's lodge in the Catoctin Mountains of Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Camp David is maintained by the National Park Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do you know how much that costs?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have just been corrected by the clerk. Camp David was under the National Park Service when I knew about it, but it has now been taken over. I understand the Navy Department is responsible for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does anyone know how much the operation and maintenance of Camp David costs?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is under the Navy. The Senator from New Mexico is not present, but perhaps he would have a figure for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say I addressed a letter to the Bureau of the Budget some days ago in this regard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The money for it is not in this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On June 18 I addressed a letter asking for an immediate reply on this and other matters. We were in communication with the Bureau of the Budget last night, and understood a letter was on its way. It was slow in coming, so we asked to have it delivered. When the letter came, it had only the information previously contained in the House hearings, which, to my mind, was not responsive to the questions I addressed.

It should be noted that the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has stated in connection with this matter that it had trouble in getting information.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Legislative Reference Service says that the Navy has the responsibility for Camp David.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the responsibility?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Legislative Reference Service says:

> No cost data on Camp David has been obtainable thus far, either from the White House or from the Navy Department which is responsible for Camp David's administration.

It is not in this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not under the National Park Service?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it under the Army?

Mr. MAGNUSON. My information was that costs of Camp David were in the Army Budget, but the Legislative Reference Service says that the Navy administers Camp David.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can we find out from the Navy how much its operation costs?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I suggest that the Senator might ask President Truman. President Truman had the same place when he was President of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are not considering President Truman's budget. We are considering the budget for 1960.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Camp David was built by President Roosevelt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Washington, I take it, is aware of the statement made by the Library of Congress, as shown at page 128 of the House hearings:

> Our office has attempted to obtain official data from the White House on such Presidential expenses chargeable to other budget accounts, but to date this information has not been made available.

That is a polite statement saying it was either delayed or refused. I can say that as of this afternoon the information has not been made available by the Bureau of the Budget. They are still holding out on the matter. I want to know what is behind this curtain of evasion. It is amazing that one can find out more from the press on such matters than from the Budget Bureau.

I am going to offer an amendment, I will say, which I hope the committee will accept, to provide that in any request hereafter submitted for appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the executive office of the President there shall be included a statement of any services or facilities proposed to be made available to the President under other appropriation accounts, and their amounts.

We stand for publicity on these matters—for the public's right to know. The administration and the Budget Bureau evidently do not believe in this.

Mr. President, I take it we do not quite know who does pay the bill for Camp David, but at least it is not charged to the President's budget. Is that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not in this appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore it is not charged in any detail of the President's budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the very able Senator from Washington, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, will use his good offices to see that we get an account of the expenses of Camp David.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that could be obtained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Speaking of transportation, I find in the U.S. News &

World Report, which is edited by David Lawrence, who certainly cannot be accused of being an opponent of this administration or a severe critic of the President, in the issue of March 15, 1957, a picture of a motorized golf car which he says is used by the President to reduce his walking on the golf course. I had always thought this was a golf car presented to the President by friends, but it is stated that friends have given him a similar golf car, which means that this golf car was evidently furnished by others than friends.

In the House hearings on page 129, in the second paragraph from the top, it is stated:

President Eisenhower also has the use of a motorized golf car which cost approximately $1,000. It is driven by a Secret Service man.

To whom are the costs of the services of this Secret Service chauffeur charged? Are they charged to the White House budget, or are they charged to the Treasury Department?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are charged to the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could the Senator inform us who paid for the $1,000 motorized golf car? This is not the one contributed by friends.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That I do not know. This is the first I have heard about it. I can assure the Senator from Illinois it is not covered in this appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since it was not given by friends, as is stated by the U.S. News & World Report article, it must have been purchased by someone. Is the cost in the budget for the White House?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure it is not in this budget. The President could use the special fund he has for such a thing. That is $50,000 the President has, for which he is not accountable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the committee would work on this subject, to see who paid for the golf car.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So far as I know, the President pays for his own golf fees at various clubs. This motorized golf car is used to conserve the health of the President, in the same way a tennis court was built on the White House grounds for President Theodore Roosevelt, which is still maintained, and in the same way a swimming pool was built for President Roosevelt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was built by private subscription, in the case of President Roosevelt. It was a private subscription conducted by William Randolph Hearst.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To which Roosevelt does the Senator refer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was for the swimming pool?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was for the swimming pool. I happened to have been connected with the Hearst newspapers at the time and I know about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me we have to maintain the health of our Presidents, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not think I am attacking these items. No. No. I want our President to have the very best.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am merely pointing out how much he has; that is all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We are very lucky to have a healthy President. What we want to do is keep him heatlhy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the Senator approves of all these services which are provided?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Sometimes I do not approve of all the services, but it seems to me the President has to have sufficient automobiles to get around.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Twenty?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He has to have sufficient administrative assistants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Including eight limousines?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He has to have an opportunity for exercise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Six airplanes? Two helicopters?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two naval vessels?

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a few more questions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I hope the Senator will limit himself to questions. Otherwise I may be obliged to ask for the regular order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. The Senator from Washington is a very expert witness, and I want to develop these facts by a colloquy with the Senator.

Is it not true that there has been a steady upward trend in the costs of the White House and in the costs of the Executive Office of the President, in regard to the hiring of personnel in so-called special positions and supergrades?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Illinois, I do not have the figures, and they are not included in our hearings. Those figures may be included in the House hearings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator will find them in the House hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not familiar with that phase of the matter. I know there have been added to the White House staff what we call super grades, or special advisers, or special assistants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that whereas in 1952 there were nine super grade and special positions—namely, those in grades 16, 17, and 18 and the uppermost group above grade 18—there are 20 at the present time in such positions at the White House?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Without giving the Senator the numbers, I will say I checked on this matter a little bit today.

There were two or three extra grades provided in 1949, and some more in 1956. In 1956 there were 4 provided in the GS–16 grade, 2 in the GS–17 grade, and 14 special positions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That made 20.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS So I was correct in saying that there are now 20 supergrade or special positions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the Senator inform me as to how many of those supergrade and special positions there were in 1952?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am informed that there were 16 or 17 in 1952.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator is in error. I have before me a Senate committee print, in the 85th Congress, 2d session, of an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. On page 44 it is stated that in 1952 there were 9 supergrade positions in the White House, of which 8 were so-called special positions, and one was a supergrade. Has the Senator from Washington had an opportunity to familiarize himself with the table which I have given him?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The number has gone up. There are more positions in the special or supergrade category.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], in his very able speech, pointed out that the services of seven of those employees are primarily used for lobbying.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is exactly correct. The Wall Street Journal, which is certainly not an antiadministration organ, made a very careful study, and made the assertion to which I have referred. It has not been challenged. It appeared on June 16. That is 300 percent more than Roosevelt or Truman ever had.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that this is an appropriation bill. All these grades have been created by Congress, at one time or another. Whether we should have created them or not, I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We only created them, did we not, at the President's request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have been very indulgent towards the President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We feel in duty bound to pay the salaries. What those employees are or are not doing is something else but the positions were created by law at the President's request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Washington if the Bureau of the Budget is not a very important arm of the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is more important than that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean it is not merely an arm, but the cerebellum?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And not merely an arm.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Washington stated the increase in the number of supergrades in the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not have those figures, but I can obtain them for the RECORD. Does the Senator from Illinois have them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; would the Senator from Washington appreciate it if the Senator from Illinois were to supply them?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I certainly would.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There were 14 supergrade and special positions in 1952. There are 41 today. Does not that indicate that the Bureau of the Budget has done all right by itself?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Bureau of the Budget could very well take care of itself when it sends up the budget. The Bureau of the Budget prepares it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And it outlines the number of supergrades.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Washington had a distinguished naval career in World War II. Did he not always notice that the headquarters staff was always greatly over strength, and that, in the Army, for example, there would be a great aggregation of colonels, lieutenant colonels, and brigadiers on the headquarters staff; and, in the Navy, of commanders, captains, and commodores?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that is a fair observation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau of the Budget, which keeps down the expenditures of other organizations, seems to have been very charitable with itself; is not that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has been an increase from 14 to 41 in the supergrades in the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And an increase from 9 to 20 at the White House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the President now has working for him 61 of these supermen—I will not say supermen; but they are paid as though they were supermen. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the correct figure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are as thick, are they not, as flies used to be on custard pies in a railway boarding house?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not having eaten in many railway boarding houses, I would not be an authority on that subject; but they are pretty thick.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Seriously, let me ask this general question: Does not the Senator from Washington believe that we should and can make savings in the President's budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington was hopeful, first, that with all the discussion by the White House itself, complaining, before the fact, that we were throwing money around, that we were spenders, and all that sort of thing; and making a plea—and rightly so—for a balanced budget, a better example could have been set by those who make the plea.

However, the Senator from Washington has always taken the position that unless there is something which, on its face, is very unusual, he would be willing to go along with the House, as he has done on many occasions, in connection with what it has allowed the President. Sometimes I do not think he should have some of the things he has requested, but he is the President. Some Presidents would not ask for such things, but if that is what he thinks he wants, I am inclined to go along.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator's slogan, "Give the President Everything He Asks For"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; not everything. But I believe the American people should know that, in the items listed for White House expenditures, all expenditures should be listed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator will accept the amendment which I propose to offer, providing that in the future all expenditures for items now charged to other departments, but used by the President, shall be stated by the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not yet been able to get this information from the Bureau of the Budget. It has erected a curtain—I will not call it an iron curtain, a bamboo curtain, or an Executive privilege curtain, because Executive privilege has not yet been invoked; but I will call it a comity curtain—and evasion by delay and circumlocution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Bureau of the Budget should be the first to give those figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And if it does not give the figures, it creates in the minds of the public the idea that there is something wrong. Is not that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Bureau of the Budget will reverse its policy. I find, from the letter just delivered to me, that it hopes that by the end of this week there will be a complete listing. So let us hope that reform really penetrates the Bureau of the Budget, and that it will give us the truth.

The Senator from Washington made the very interesting point that if one asks others to economize, he should set a good example. The Senator will remember the writings of Confucius, who was a wise Prime Minister as well as a Chinese philosopher. Confucius said that the most important thing an executive can do is to set a good example.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That has always been a good rule to follow. It has been said, I suppose, by many people. But particularly when one protests so loudly, as in this particular case, before anything happens, that everyone up here is throwing money away——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The President has charged and is charging that we are wild spenders——

Mr. MAGNUSON. He should set a good example. The extra men in the Bureau of the Budget, and the President, are the people who are going to hold the line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 61 supermen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. A better example could have been set.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Washington will not yield the floor immediately, because I should like to ask him one or two more questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator had completed his interrogation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. The question I should like to address to him is this: Does the Senator remember not only the saying of Confucius but also the popular aphorism in this country to this effect: "What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Washington think that this saying has some connection with the budget of the President and his comments about the budget with respect to other Government services?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only that, but to the budget itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The Administration preaches economy and yet it fills its ranks with highly paid people. They promote each other. Is that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They not only promote each other, but I remember that the whole State Department and the whole Army had been housed in one building across the street from the White House. That is within my own political lifetime. Now it is all filled up with the executive offices of the President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, neither the Senator from Washington nor the Senator from Illinois is planning to return to the days of Grover Cleveland.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who had one Secretary and who used to answer the telephone himself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But we do say that the office of the President should be conducted with economy and efficiency and relative simplicity. Is that not true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Relative simplicity will set an example in these times, and tend toward balancing the budget, and at least it would be helpful to get what is called a sound dollar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate what the Senator from Washington has been doing, and I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the amendment which he has prepared. The Senator from Illinois has a similar amendment he will propose if the opportunity offers. He will offer amendments which will save $675,000 from the office of the President, from the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget and from special projects—that mysterious bourne, into which no one ever penetrates and from which no dollar e'er returns.

It may be that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin has priority. However, first I believe we should let our long-suffering friends on the other side respond. Then I shall ask for the floor in my own right to move a cut in the President's budget.

First I believe the Senator from Colorado has been heating up for some time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Anyone listening to this debate for the last hour certainly would be long-suffering.

Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, since there is no reply from the other side, I claim the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quarrel with the motives of anyone who explores this sort of thing. I believe, however, that the whole story should be told. I know that such remarks as have been made create a great reader interest. We will find them on the front pages of the newspapers. It is so easy to get a line on Camp David. But the whole story is that Camp David used to be Camp Shangri-La, and was acquired under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Let us get the whole story. Let us get the whole picture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I stated that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Washington has set that forth; yes. However, I want to be sure that it is properly emphasized. It is easy to attack these increases without drawing the proper deductions. For example, there is the transfer of employees to the executive payroll and setting forth any kind of figures. But the fact is—and I will stand on it—that there are 100 fewer persons now on the White House executive roll than there were on the 30th of June 1952. If anyone wishes to have that established, we will establish it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I challenge it and I have already placed the correct figures in the record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will establish it in due course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say that the figures prepared by the budget are incorrect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Colorado either has or will put certain figures in the RECORD. It is so easy to argue as to what the appropriations show. However, what is the whole story when we begin to take all the figures from the Library of Congress?

There is another possible reason why White House office appropriations and personnel have increased substantially since 1938. Although we are unable to document it, veteran Bureau of the Budget employees state that until 1947 the White House secured a large proportion of its staff by detail from other agencies.

That statement appears at page 138 of the House hearings, and was prepared by the Library of Congress.

I want the whole story told about how these things came about. There has been an increase in the money appropriated for every benefit that is voted, and for everyone on the payroll of the Government. The White House staff gets these fringe benefits. Let us not forget that the country has grown, that the chores have grown, and that, as a consequence, the costs have increased. If we are going to compare them, let us compare them paragraph by paragraph.

I shall not weary the Senate at this late hour. However there are a few things that must be put in the RECORD. We are dealing with aircraft. I ask unanimous consent that all of the fine print on page 142 of the House hearings be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The only aircraft assigned for White House usage is one USAF C–121–E Super Constellation (the *Columbine*). However, it is not used exclusively by the President but has been used on occasion for the travel of the Secretary of State and high foreign dignitaries during official visits to the United States.

The flight crew of the C–121–E assigned to the White House consists of three officers, two warrant officers, four airmen. There are 8 airmen assigned as security guards and 11 airmen assigned as maintenance crew. Total operating cost for the *Columbine* is $198 per flying hour. This is a direct operating cost and includes petroleum and its products, $88.67; crew, temporary duty, $4.50; and base pay for flight crew, $104.83.

The total flying hours logged for C–121–E (*Columbine*) for fiscal year 1958 was 412 hours. The total direct operating cost is therefore $81,576. This does not include the pay of the 8 guards or 11 maintenance men.

In addition to the *Columbine*, the President over a brief period used a two-engine Aero-Commander plane for short-range, limited-facility use. This plane was supplied from the special air missions group of the Air Force.

The President for the past 6 years has always had one large plane assigned to him and access to smaller planes as needed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now allude to the first paragraph of the statement:

The only aircraft assigned for White House usage is one USAF C–121E super Constellation (the *Columbine*).

When it comes to others, and when they need some for dignitaries who are visiting, the White House can get them, but the *Columbine*—just as in the case of the *Independence* of President Truman—is the only plane exclusively assigned to the President.

The second thing I wish to put in the RECORD is with respect to the jet planes to which reference has been made. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum in small print on page 143 of the House hearings be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No planes are being acquired for the exclusive use of the President or the White House; as is the *Columbine*.

There are three jet transports now on order by the U.S. Air Force for assignment to its Special Air Missions Group. These airplanes are the military versions of the Boeing 707 and have been designated VC–137–A. The aircraft were not ordered for any one individual or special group. They will take their place in the SAM fleet as replacements for Lockheed Constellation-type aircraft.

The Air Force provided in the fiscal year 1958 program for three VC–137 jet transports at $4.7 million flyaway cost each for a total flyaway cost of $14.1 million. Direct operating cost is estimated at $270.86 per flying hour. This figure includes POL $223.06, crew TDY $4, base pay of flight crew $43.80.

The SAM mission is to provide expeditious air transportation for high ranking U.S. Government officials conducting official business throughout the world. Invited foreign dignitaries and heads of state are also provided SAM service while in guest status. In the past, SAM planes have carried the President, the Vice President, visiting dignitaries, the Secretary of State, Cabinet officers and their deputies, Members of Congress, and officials of the Department of Defense.

There are no helicopters specifically assigned to the President. When he requires helicopter transportation, it is requested from Army and Marine units in the local area. The Marine helicopter squadron is at the Marine Corps Air Station, Quantico; the Army unit is at Davison Army Airfield at Fort Belvoir. These units are stationed in the area for other missions and perform the small additional task of making occasional flights for the President. The type of helicopter which the President uses is the Sikorsky S–58 which is known as the HUS–1 by the Marines, and H–34 by the Army. Operating costs for these helicopters, including fuel, crewing, maintenance, and depreciation, are $350 per hour. Since the President's first flight in these helicopters (September 7, 1957), he has accumulated 21 hours, which would be a total cost of $7,350. (This is exclusive of the cost of operating the helicopters which the President used during his campaign trip in October 1958, which were paid for by the Republican National Committee.)

In addition to the occasional flights which he makes, there are two helicopters on standby to relocate the President and his family in case of a civil defense alert directing the evacuation of Washington. These helicopters are supplied on a rotating basis from the Marine and Army units mentioned above. Since these helicopters are flown on training missions during such duty, provided they remain within a short distance of the White House, this duty does not materially interfere with their military mission.

The President did on one occasion fly in an Air Force Bell H–13J during Operation Alert 1957. He made two flights, one on the 12th and one on the 15th of July, for a total of 2 hours and 5 minutes flight time at a cost of about $252. These helicopters were procured by the 1254th Air Transport Group at Washington National Airport for use by high Government officials. They were found to be too small for carrying the party that normally accompanies the President and, therefore, have not so been used since, although we understand they are still in use by the 1254th Air Transport Group.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should now like to read some of that language:

No planes are being acquired for the exclusive use of the President or the White House, as is the *Columbine*.

Senators may wonder about the jets. They are replacements for the Lockheed Constellation type aircraft, and they belong to the so-called special air mission, for the dignitaries, and generals, and, I suppose, Senators and Representatives can also use them. Let us put all this in proper context, and not say that these planes are exclusively assigned to the President of the United States, because that is not true.

There is a certain mendacity about it if anyone tries to pin that on the President of the United States. The President is a man without guile, trying to do

his job as best he can. It is an amazing political exploration to demean him in this way. The British Queen is not demeaned in any such manner. The *Britannia* will sail the seas. There would not be a Canadian, there would not be an Englishman raising his voice to talk about how much money the British sovereign spends. Yet here in the greatest country on earth, the richest country, we cavil about a few helicopters and about a few automobiles and about a few motor launches and about a few gardeners at the White House. God save the mark. How petty can we get? How mincing can we get?

We demean the President of the United States. That is a fine way to build up our country abroad. Those are the things which can make the headlines in East Germany or in the Orient: "Senators Attack the President."

The distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin wants to tell the President now how to reorder his office. That is the purport of his amendment which is pending. He wants to tie the President's hands. He wants to tell him whom he can hire and whom he cannot hire.

Congress amended the law with respect to the executive branch in 1956. The President can have eight assistants or other staff personnel. Now the junior Senator from Wisconsin wants to reduce the number. I do not know whether that is a confession that the assistants have done effective work, or whether it is a reflection upon the gullibility of the Senate. Whatever it is, it is amazing that it should be done.

The House does not dictate to the Senate whom we shall have. The Senate does not dictate to the House whom the House shall have. The President does not dictate to us.

Nobody quarrels with the junior Senator from Wisconsin when he puts 75 persons on his payroll. If Senators think I am kidding about that——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a moment. If Senators think I am "kidding," here is the report.

I am talking about the Proxmire amendment, which would tell the President whom he can have on his staff, whether he can have a deputy assistant to the President, or whether he can have liaison officers. How can their duties be defined?

I do not tell the Senator from Wisconsin whether he can have 75 persons on his staff. But there it is, printed in the Secretary's report. He can have as many as he likes. But I do not think he ought to come before the Senate and seek to impose a crippling amendment on the President of the United States simply because he thinks that the liaison agents, like former Representative Jack Anderson, of California, may have been a little too effective. That is a fine intrusion, is it not, upon the Chief Executive?

I shall not continue; I simply wanted to put this matter in proper context.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has said that I have 75 persons on my staff. I do not. The fact is that when this publication was issued, or during the period to which it refers, at one time or another—never at the same time—75 different persons had worked in my office. My maximum size staff was far less. But I should like to tell the Senator from Illinois why I had as many as I had. I have explained it to the people of Wisconsin; I have explained it to the press. It is a matter of record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have to have an explanation by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois asked for it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not care about the explanation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois raised the point. I should like to answer it. First, I voluntarily published the full payroll—the amount paid to everyone on my staff. Only a very small number of Senators have done this. Instead of relying on full-time workers, a number of people who worked for me worked only one-fourth, one-quarter time. In the case of many who worked for me it was like having one-fourth of a person in my office.

I hired people to work 10 hours a week. They were largely graduate students at Georgetown University, or American University. They were competent young persons. I was delighted to have the opportunity to help them earn enough money to earn their degrees. They did excellent work.

I insisted on keeping track of every bit of work they did. We had an accounting system in our office, so we knew exactly who came in and when all the work was accomplished. We had a unit work system. It worked very well.

At present, however, I have, probably, fewer persons on my staff than the junior Senator from Illinois has on his.

The junior Senator from Illinois seems enraged—unhappy, at least—because I have pointed out that since President Eisenhower took office he has increased his lobbying staff from one or two persons, which, according to the Wall Street Journal, was the largest number President Roosevelt or President Truman ever had, to seven persons, whose job it is to influence Congress, to tell Congress what to do, in violation of the Constitution and in violation of the Criminal Code. There is no question at all, in my judgment, or I think in the judgment of any objective observer, that this constitutes an effort on the part of the President to impose his will upon Congress, in violation, as I say, of the laws of this country and the Constitution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When we talk about increases in other areas, perhaps we should become a little introspective and look at ourselves. Since 1954, the legislative appropriation has jumped from $49 million to $120 million. I do not have the exact amount. There has been an addition of some 1,200 or 1,300 employees on Capitol Hill since 1954. That is testimony to the fact that the country is growing and that the business of Congress is growing. I am always glad to vote money for the legislative branch.

But, in the same proportion, the business of the President grows, too. Let us be fair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to place this in perspective, as the Senator from Illinois has suggested. The committee allowed the full amount to the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. The Senator from Washington is a very appreciative person.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not want the RECORD to show that no mater what we allow the President or what the British Parliament allows the Queen, there is much discussion in the British Parliament about what the Queen spends. Nevertheless, they allow her sufficient money.

What Congress allows the President is our concern. I think we have allowed him sufficient money. The junior Senator from Illinois has served with me on the Committee on Appropriations, as has the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I do not thing the Senator from Illinois wants to suggest that the American people are not supposed to know what the money is being spent for any why it is being spent, and perhaps express an opinion as to whether it is too little, or too much. That is all that is being done today. I do not know of any amendments to reduce the amount proposed to be appropriated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The President has not complained. He is trying to organize his staff. Now the Senator from Wisconsin is trying to tell him whom he may have on his staff.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the Senator from Wisconsin is merely saying that he thinks the President has too many persons on his staff.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is not what he said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are many persons who have the same opinion, I must say. Perhaps I do not share the opinion, but the Senator from Wisconsin surely has the right to say that. He represents some of the people who are paying the bill.

I think we have a right to discuss the matter. I hope there will be no suggestion that we should not discuss it; that we should say, as may be said to the Queen of England, "Whatever you want, go ahead." I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did that. I wanted to place the matter in perspective to that extent. We have provided for the President a pretty good amount.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us see whether the Senator from Wisconsin is going to tell the President whom he can have on his staff. Here is what his amendment provides. It strikes out the figure "$2,221,000" and substitutes in lieu thereof "$2,136,000." That is quite a substantial reduction.

Then comes the limitation:

> No part of the appropriation shall be available for the payment of compensation to (1) any person occupying the position of assistant to the deputy assistant to the President—

That means that none of the money can be used for that purpose—

(2) Any person occupying the position of staff assistant to the President.

The statute gives the President the authority to have eight staff assistants. Look at the statute. Then:

(3) Not more than four administrative assistants to the President.

Is that telling the President whom he can hire? If it is not, I have never seen the English language.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, it is not. And the minority leader knows it is not.

Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. FREAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think no one can disagree with the fact that not only Congress but also the public has a right to know how and where the money is spent. But I object, and object vigorously, to the context in which the questions were asked particularly to the innuendos which were cast and to the way in which they were made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he yielded for a speech?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will ask the junior Senator from Illinois a question. Is it not a fact that during the last two hours the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] usurped the floor and made speeches lasting for 15 or 20 minutes, while he was attempting to utilize the floor under the guise of the question rule?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will amend that by striking out the word "usurp"; but I will say that the rest is correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLOTT. Is not the Senator from Illinois aware that in the legislative branch of the Government the number of employees—those of Congress—increased from 5,480, in 1953, to 6,561, as of the present time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, the number has increased more than that.

Mr. ALLOTT. Under the obligational authority of Congress, is it not a fact that the number of employees of the Architect of the Capitol increased from 1,042 to 1,225?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is what the records show.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me to request unanimous consent to have the table to which I have been referring printed at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legislative branch

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT (AS REPORTED TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION)

	June 30, 1953	June 30, 1954	June 30, 1955	June 30, 1956	June 30, 1957	June 30, 1958	Dec. 31, 1958
Congress	(1)	5,480	5,629	6,277	6,554	6,788	6,561
Architect of the Capitol		1,042	1,034	1,097	1,088	1,152	1,225
Total	(2)	6,522	6,663	7,374	7,642	7,940	7,786

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

[In thousands]

	Actual 1953	Actual 1954	Actual 1955	Actual 1956	Actual 1957	Actual 1958	Estimate 1959	Estimate 1960
Congress	$39,802	$40,740	$46,731	$59,883	$60,924	$64,094	$70,026	$72,535
Architect of the Capitol	4,321	5,957	37,323	114,947	6,252	9,796	14,300	6,623
Total	44,123	46,697	84,054	174,830	67,176	73,890	84,326	79,158

EXPENDITURES

Congress	$36,956	$37,618	$42,719	$53,338	$56,356	$60,786	$61,000	$61,850
Architect of the Capitol	9,680	6,279	6,776	11,375	21,231	16,465	30,512	61,309
Total	46,636	43,897	49,495	64,713	77,587	77,251	91,512	123,159

[1] No reports of civilian employment by the Congress were made to the Civil Service Commission prior to March 1954.

[2] Not available.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Illinois aware that the compensation of the President of the United States is now the same as it was in 1952?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. So the compensation received by the President is no more or no less than it was at that time. Is not that true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask the Senator from Illinois whether the appropriations for the White House Office in 1952 were $1,883,615, as opposed to $2,221,000 for the fiscal year 1960. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is the Senator from Illinois also aware that the total number of persons employed in the White House Office in 1952 was 261, and the estimated number for the fiscal year 1960 is 272?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is the Senator from Illinois also aware that the total number of employees in the White House, disregarding the employees for civil defense activities, who have been put there, was 1,504 in 1952 and is estimated to be 1,404 in 1960?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I so indicated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield, to permit me to request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum on the White House and Executive Office personnel as of 1952, as compared with the estimated personnel in 1960? The table shows that when the figures are adjusted to omit the employees of the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization, the total cost in 1952 was $11,469,265, as compared with an estimated total for 1960 of $14,595,500.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I think that is disclosed by the evidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

White House and Executive Office personnel, 1952 and 1960

	1952		1960 (estimated)	
	Appropriations	Number of positions	Appropriations	Number of positions
Compensation of the President	$150,000	1	$150,000	1
White House Office	1,883,615	261	2,221,000	272
Executive Mansion and Grounds	335,600	71	475,000	72
White House Police	652,000	170	1,055,000	170
Bureau of the Budget	3,608,000	515	4,665,000	435
Council of Economic Advisers	341,800	47	395,000	31
Emergency Fund for the President	[1] 1,000,000	[2] 82	1,000,000	[2] 5
National Security Council	160,000	23	792,000	[3] 77
National Security Resources Board	1,627,000	135		
Office of Defense Mobilization	1,711,250	199		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization			86,970,000	1,768
Special projects			1,500,000	101
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization			57,500	5
Total	11,469,265	1,504	99,280,500	2,937
Deduct: Civil defense activities			−84,685,000	[4] −1,533
Total, adjusted for comparability	11,469,265	1,504	14,595,500	1,404

[1] For purposes of comparability, excludes reappropriation of $4,580,100.

[2] Represents average number of personnel on a full-year basis; number of positions not available.

[3] Reflects incorporation of Operations Coordinating Board, heretofore financed, as an interdepartmental committee group, out of departmental budgets.

[4] It is estimated that 235 positions and $2,285,000, the amount of the 1959 Office of Defense Mobilization appropriation, are applied to functions of the former Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois another question: On page 129 of the House committee hearings, we find, with respect to the *Barbara Ann:*

In place of the *Williamsburg,* President Eisenhower has the use of two naval vessels, the *Barbara Ann* and the *Susie E,* named after two of his granddaughters.

Does the Senator from Illinois find in the hearings anything to indicate that the former President of the United States had ever used the same vessels?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The records show that those vessels were acquired either in 1946 or before then. One was used by the Secret Service, to accompany the *Williamsburg;* and the other was used by the President's family. So they were acquired long before this administration came into office.

Mr. ALLOTT. As a matter of fact, they were then called the *Eleanor* and the *Margie,* were they not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. They were acquired in 1945.

Was the Senator from Illinois present when the *Williamsburg* used to cruise up and down the Potomac River, with the President aboard?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was never aboard that vessel.

Mr. ALLOTT. I mean, was the Senator from Illinois ever in Washington at that time, and did he ever see that vessel?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have seen the *Williamsburg* on Chesapeake Bay. I do not recall seeing it on the Potomac River. The records show that in 1952 the *Williamsburg* had an active crew of 8 officers and 110 enlisted men.

Mr. ALLOTT. That vessel was decommissioned by President Eisenhower, was it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, in 1953.

Mr. ALLOTT. And it is now a part of the Naval forces at New London, Conn., is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Either that, or it is put into mothballs—either one or the other.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think I shall postpone my further questions until I see what develops. The Senator from Illinois has had the floor, and I have not had it. I shall wait until I can speak in my own time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask my colleague not to leave the Chamber until I make a statement, please.

My colleague from Illinois made what I am sure was an inadvertent error, which is pardonable, when he stated that the material from which he quoted on page 138 was prepared by the Library of Congress. It is so designated in the House committee hearings, but that is a typographical error. The report of the Library of Congress begins on page 127 and continues through the top of page 138. The Bureau of the Budget then prepared its reply, which runs from page 138 to page 141 and certain following paragraphs; and the junior Senator from Illinois, in perfectly good faith, has been quoting from that reply. But, by a typographical error—we have checked on this—this second statement was prepared, not by the Library of Congress, but by the Bureau of the Budget; and it really constitutes a reply by the Bureau of the Budget to the initial statement made by the Library of Congress.

As I tried to make clear during the colloquy, a very grave statistical error was made by deducting from the 1960 appropriation figures the appropriations for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—a deduction of $84,685,000 and of 1,533 positions—but retaining in the figures for 1952 the expenditures for the National Security Resources Board and for the Office of Defense Mobilization—which amounted, respectively, to $1,627,000, and $1,711,250, or a total of $3,338,250.

But it is more appropriate to consider a comparison of the personnel. When we add the 1952 figures for the National Security Resources Board, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—amounting, respectively, to 135, 199, and 1,175—or a total of 1,509—we find that figure is the equivalent of the 1,768, which is the number of the personnel for 1960 in comparable positions; and we find that these figures indicate a net increase of 262 during this period.

I may say also that there has been a great increase in the White House staff; and, of course, the new monstrosity—the "Special projects" item—was created. It did not exist prior to 1956; but in that year it was given an appropriation of $1,250,000, which since then has been increased to $1,500,000. Yet this is one of the reasons why there has been some confusion on the part of my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. President, let me say that I was a little startled at the statement by my colleague from Illinois that we should not scrutinize the expenditures of the President, and that, somehow, it would be unpatriotic to do so; and—perhaps in view of the approaching visit of the Queen of England—he suggested that since the British Parliament does not inquire into the expenditures of the Queen of England, it was, somehow, unpatriotic for us to inquire into the expenditures of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I had not been aware that we had crowned the Queen of England in this country or that we were attributing to the President of the United States the same monarchial splendor which has been provided for the Queen of England.

Even though our imaginations may be touched by the coming of this beautiful young lady, I do not think we wish to transform this country from a republic into a monarchy. I had not thought Illinois had ceased to be a Republican and had become a monarchist. In a democracy we have the right to scrutinize expenditures of all groups, including our own. I am not in favor of putting a crown on the head of the President of the United States. We settled that long ago and I at least do not want to return to any condition resembling it.

The senior Senator from Illinois feels he is privileged to speak on this subject, because those of us who were here from 1949 through 1952 will remember that very often the senior Senator from Illinois took the floor and proposed cuts in the Truman budgets. He was not censured for those efforts by the leaders of his party. No one ever said that the President was sacrosanct, that his budget should not be questioned. I admit that the senior Senator from Illinois was frequently voted down, but the charge was never made that in trying to bring about economy he was helping the East Germans or the Chinese or other groups. In fact, as the senior Senator from Illinois used to make these attempts for economy, he would notice broad smiles of approval, at times coming quite openly, from the other side of the aisle. They seemed to enjoy it so long as the whiplash was being laid on a Democratic President. They not only enjoyed others laying the whiplash on a Democratic President, but, in unmerciful fashion, they would attack the Democratic Presidents, Harry Truman and Franklin Roosevelt.

I heard the most vitriolic statements made about them and the most vicious comments about the personal expenditures and personal habits of those Presidents.

But now, suddenly, we cannot ask a question about who pays the bill for all this luxury, we cannot even ask a question as to these little naval vessels. We cannot ask a question about the bubble-top Lincoln, or the three jet airplanes that cost $4.7 million apiece, or the Super-Constellations, or the two shorter range airplanes, or the special golf car. As for mentioning the helicopter, that is outside the ball park completely.

Our friends across the aisle seem to have a double standard of ethics. It is all right to pan Democratic Presidents in the severest of terms, but it is almost treason to inquire what a Republican President is spending in the way of money and what the taxpayers are paying. I am not attacking the President. I am merely criticizing his expenditures. Every American citizen has that right.

We should consider the taxpayers primarily. They are the ones who foot the bill. We should at least find out what is being spent for the operation of the White House, and introduce reasonable economies there, if possible.

Senators may remember that some weeks ago the senior Senator from Illinois questioned the expenditures of the Senate itself. He questioned spending $4 million to extend a subway which runs nowhere, and which was probably built through an architectural error, not knowing that the plans for an underground garage had been changed.

The Senator from Illinois was critical of the action of Congress. He did not make himself too popular with his colleagues by doing that, but he was trying to save $4 million for the taxpayers.

The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Illinois were very critical

about putting carpets at a cost of $150,000, on rubber tiled floors which had already cost $100,000. Then when the carpets were put on the floors, it was discovered the doors could not be closed, because the doors had been designed for use with rubber tiled floors, so the doors had to be altered and cut down.

Those events reminded me of the Peterkin family, which was always getting into trouble, and they would have to call on the lady from Philadelphia to bail them out. One morning the Peterkin family made coffee. By mistake, they put salt in the coffee instead of sugar. Then they tried to sweeten the coffee by pouring in sugar. They made the coffee too sweet, so they poured in more salt. That made the coffee too salty. Then they poured more sugar in the coffee. That made it too sweet. Finally they called the lady from Philadelphia to help them. She said, "Throw it all out, and make a new batch."

That is all the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wisconsin were trying to do about the carpet over tile floors.

So I think the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Illinois have a record of opposing waste—waste wherever it occurs, whether it be waste in Congress, or waste in the Executive offices. I maintain we have a right to inquire into waste in the Presidential office. That is what we are doing.

Here is an Executive office which had 9 supergrade positions in 1952, and which now has 20 supergrade positions. We have a Budget Bureau which had 14 supergrade positions in 1952, and which has 41 now. The President has 61 supergrade employees.

I admit—I not only admit, but assert—that probably President Eisenhower needs more help than President Truman did. President Truman worked hard at his job, and, working hard at the job, he needed only nine supergrade assistants. I would not expect the present Chief Executive to be cut back to nine supergrade assistants. That would be too rigid.

The Budget Bureau under President Truman was an efficient organization. I know the Bureau has its difficulties. I would not expect to cut it back to 14 supergrades, but if the Senator from Illinois has the opportunity, he is going to move to reduce the number of supergrade positions in the Office of the President by 5—which is, interestingly enough, the very number the Senator from Wisconsin, without consultation with me, arrived at. I am going to move to reduce the number of supergrade positions in the Bureau of the Budget by 10.

This will save at least $15,000 a job. In addition, there is at least a $5,000 secretary. In my judgment, there is also probably a secretary for a secretary, but we will not count that. It will save $20,000 a job, at a minimum, say, of 15 jobs, or a saving of $300,000.

Then the Senator from Illinois is going to move, if he has an opportunity, to take $375,000 out of the mysterious slush fund called "special projects," which has sprung up and grown like a yupas tree to $1½ million.

The Senator from Illinois is going to propose total savings of $675,000. In addition, he is going to ask that in the future we may know how much the airplanes and helicopters and naval vessels and chauffeurs and personal waiters and servants detached from the military cost, and to whom they are charged.

Senators on the other side of the aisle may work themselves into a lather and say we should not question the expenditures of the President, but I think we should remember the taxpayers, we should remember the farmer who gets up early in the morning and works through the day, who has a low income, but has to pay taxes to support activities of this kind; we should remember the wage earner who works at his job 40 hours a week and pays 20 percent or more of his income in taxes, and the small businessman, already facing extinction, who pays heavy taxes to support all these activities.

We should consider these men and women. We should realize that the public purse is not without limits; that private resources are limited; that we should introduce efficiency and economy in government service; and that not even the White House or the Congress is exempt from this requirement.

Let us help the President to practice what he preaches. If, beguiled by those around him, he departs from the simplicity which should be characteristic of a chief executive in a democracy, and if he should want to imitate the regal habits of monarchy, let us save him from that temptation. Let us return to democratic simplicity and thus help the President to set a good example for the American people, for by doing so we are really assisting him in fulfilling what I still believe to be the desire of his heart.

Mr. President, I had a long speech prepared on this subject, but I am not going to deliver it. I think the Senator from Colorado said he wants to reply. We will see what the parliamentary situation is.

I have some amendments I should like to offer. I think the Senator from Wisconsin has priority, however. If the Senator's amendment is rejected—and I intend to vote for it—I shall then offer the other amendments, which will bring about savings totaling $600,000, without specifying the positions involved.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will take only 1 minute. I want the RECORD to show that under no circumstances shall I ever, or have I ever, undertaken to favor a concealment of or wrong disclosure of the truth. I have served on the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate for nearly 18 years. I have dedicated myself in all that time to bringing out the truth, as I saw it.

What I object to, Mr. President, is the statement of a partial truth or a half truth. I want the whole business laid out where all can see and come to their own conclusions.

The only way I can express the idea, in a half minute, is to relate a story which I told on this floor sometime ago, about the watchman at a crossing where an accident took place at night. The watchman was put on the witness stand, counsel qualified him, and asked him questions. Counsel asked, "Were you on duty at the crossing?" The man said, "I was." Counsel asked, "Was it dark?" The man said, "It was dark." Counsel asked, "Did you have your lantern?" The man said, "I had my lantern." Counsel asked, "Did you wave your lantern?" The man said, "I waved my lantern." The company obtained a judgment, and as counsel and the flagman went out, the flagman looked at counsel and said, "By golly, I am glad he did not ask me whether the lantern was lit."

Let us know whether the lantern is lit and what is the whole story.

Mr. President, I intend always to assert the need for economy with all the vigor at my command.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, my amendment is the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment would have some $84,000. It would reduce the number of lobbyists on the White House staff back to the maximum level the country ever had under any previous President. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

The office of the Presidency is the mightiest office in the world. It is occupied sometimes by a Democrat and sometimes by a Republican, but the office of the presidency must not and should not be diminished. Its flexibility and its responsibility to the Government I do not believe should be diminished by amendments, hastily added to a bill on the floor, designed to restrict the freedom of the President in organizing his office as he sees fit.

Even Members of Congress are not told what money they shall spend for an administrative assistant, for a private secretary, for a press secretary or for a research assistant. Consequently when we thus invade the separation of powers principle to try to act as a nagging nurse in regard to the wide discretion in the office of the Presidency, with its tremendous responsibilities, we are not acting properly. The President must be given latitude, so I must reluctantly oppose the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

Likewise, I shall oppose the amendments to be offered by my distinguished friend from Illinois, except the last one. I feel that the President takes the responsibility for the expenditures which he and his staff require in the administration of the executive office. These expenditures are well known, and should be well known. Perhaps the revelation of them on the floor of the Senate serves a good purpose. But I do not believe it adds to the concept of an independent executive working with an independent

legislative and an independent judiciary for us to put careless or unimportant restrictions upon the Chief Executive of this Nation, who has many duties.

I agree with point 4 of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I think the identification of the services and facilities required to be included in a statement of expenditures of the Executive Office of the President is legislation in the right direction.

Certainly I object, and I have heretofore objected on this floor, to the purchase of three jet planes for the use of the President, the distinguished members of his executive family, the Cabinet officers, and perhaps high-ranking military officers. This was an expenditure I raised my voice against long and loud, and I do not yet approve it.

I do not go along with my distinguished friend, the minority leader, in the intimation that these planes—and particularly these three planes—are not for the primary use of the President. It is all right to say they are not for the exclusive use of the President. No plane was ever built for the exclusive use of any one individual.

So when we determine whether the lantern was lit, a description of exclusive use is a little bit like an unlighted lamp.

These planes are for the principal use of the President, and the White House has consistently defended the item by saying the planes will speed the President from place to place, and the cost will not be too excessive, and so on.

It does us little good to argue at this late date about whether one of the planes is or is not for the principal use of the President of the United States. We do not accomplish anything that way. The President keeps the old-fashioned "Conny" which flies only some 300 miles an hour. Then there are two others, which were bought primarily for the use of the executive officials of the Government.

I think there should have been a request, and there should have been legislative permission granted, before $15 million worth of jet planes were purchased by MATS out of military funds for national defense, when the planes are tied up with crews ready to go and are not assigned to regular duties of airlift or anything remotely approaching it.

Certainly, I think it would be good, in the free enterprise system, to buy a plane for the President. I would have approved that, because the service and security of the plane requires mechanical perfection, and it should be, rightfully, in the hands of the military, for the President's use.

I think it would be a pretty good advertisement for our free enterprise system to charter two other planes, if it were necessary to have them, instead of buying planes and having them standing, rusting away, or becoming weather worn. The worst thing in the world for an airplane is to have it not flying. Then it is in the wrong element, on the ground. An airplane must fly in order to be a good airplane.

How easy, how inexpensive, and how fine it would be if, when the Vice President flies to open the trade fair at Moscow, he could go in a Pan American Super 707, which would be able to fly nonstop from the United States to Moscow.

The three planes which the brilliant generals bought, perhaps to make an impression on some military aides at the White House cannot fly from here to Moscow nonstop, although they are brand new planes just being delivered. However, Boeing has already delivered a Pan American plane which is an improvement on these old models our brilliant military minds bought with the MATS money. So we now have three obsolete jet planes for the executive department—admittedly for the executive department—and for a few VIP's.

The charter could have been effected at a fraction of the cost of the plane plus depreciation; and, when carrying the American flag under a free enterprise system, it would have told the Russians that Americans can pay their passage and fly anywhere in a jet plane. It would have been a great example of American ingenuity, and of the rights of our working people, who can cross the ocean for $250 in such planes. But, oh, no—we must have executive planes owned by the Government. That is the same as the Communist system.

Fortunately our privately owned airlines can and do fly farther and better, with more modern equipment.

So I agree with the last part of the distinguished Senator's amendment. I believe that this identification is necessary to protect the President himself and his office against rumors, against misinformation as to what services are being furnished. Let us have every thing on record, in connection with the appropriation bill. However, I do not believe it is in keeping with the responsibility of the legislative branch, in the constitutional division of powers which has been so long in effect, to restrict the powers, responsibilities, and flexibility of operation of the President's own office.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] [putting the question].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

On a division, Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

> In any request hereafter submitted for appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Executive Office of the President, there shall be included a statement of any services or facilities proposed to be made available to the President under other appropriation accounts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair inquire from the chairman of the committee whether there is any law of this sort at present?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not specifically. The amendment is a request for information, which I think would not be subject to a point of order. If the amendment imposed additional duties upon the President of the United States, it would be subject to a point of order; but it involves a request for information.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I am simply asking that the people's right to know be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that if the law does not already carry this obligation, this addition to an appropriation bill would place an additional duty on the President, not now provided for by law, and therefore would be improper in an appropriation bill. It is a positive directive to the President to do something that he is not now required to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the ruling of the Chair, then, that the amendment is out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senator from Massachusetts raised the point of order. I believe that on mature consideration he will conclude that he has made a moral mistake.

We have been seeking to obtain this information for some time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment. Let me finish, please.

The Congressional Library tried to obtain this information, and it was refused by the executive department, as will be evident from its statement.

On June 18 I asked for similar information from the Bureau of the Budget. I shall insert my letter in the RECORD.

This afternoon I received a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which is in no sense responsive. It merely gives material which had already been given, and does not deal with the question of

personnel and services to the President, charged to other departments.

I regard the letter of the Budget Bureau as evasive. I think the administration has made a very bad record in this matter. My amendment was designed to obtain the information. Of course, if the Senator from Massachusetts feels that this information should not be given to the public, he is privileged to make his point of order, and we have been put out of commission by a technical point.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Budget Bureau and their reply be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 18, 1959.

Mr. MAURICE STANS,
Director, the Bureau of the Budget,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: I have been reading the House hearings on the general government matters appropriation in which are to be found several tables concerning personnel, functions, and activities of the White House.

While this is the most extensive treatment of this subject which I have seen, there appear to be a number of facts which are missing and I wonder if your Bureau could provide at least one set of facts to me.

What I am interested in is the number of individuals who work at or who are assigned to the White House or to the President or his Office, who are in fact carried on the payroll of some other agency or Department. For example, there are numerous military personnel who are assigned as chauffeurs, there are the pilot and crew of the President's plane, there are various liaison officers from the military establishments as well as from other Departments and agencies, and there are a number of people from the State Department and other agencies who are assigned to the National Security Council and work in the White House.

Could a full list of these people be provided to me?

With best wishes.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1959.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I have looked into the matter of the number of individuals who work at or who are assigned to the White House or to the President or his office who are in fact carried on the payroll of some other agency or department, which you requested in your letter of June 18.

While we have some of the information which you are requesting, as in the case of the Treasury Department which has a statutory mission to protect the President, we have found it necessary to obtain certain information from the departments and agencies whose employees are assigned to the White House or to the President.

I am attaching a tabulation setting forth the number of people assigned to the White House as of June 30, 1952, and May 31, 1959, that we have been able to identify thus far. We hope by the end of this week to have a more complete listing.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

Partial listing of personnel assigned to the White House or the President and paid from appropriations of other departments and agencies as of June 30, 1952, and May 31, 1959

	June 30, 1952	May 31, 1959
Treasury Department:		
Secret Service	53 agents; 7 clerks	63 agents; 5 clerks.
White House Police	132	149.
Department of Defense:		
Presidential aircraft	*Independence*	*Columbine.*
	1 pilot	1 pilot.
	1 copilot	1 copilot
	3 flight engineers	2 flight engineers.
	1 navigator	1 navigator.
	1 radio operator	1 radio operator.
	1 flight steward	3 flight stewards.
	8 airmen and security guards	8 airmen and security guards.
	10 mechanics and ground crew	11 mechanics and ground crew.
	1 administrative personnel	1 administrative personnel.
Naval vessels:		
Williamsburg	8 officers; 110 enlisted men	
Motor launches (2)	1 officer; 8 enlisted men	1 officer; 8 enlisted men.

NOTE.—No employees are assigned from other agencies to the National Security Council and work in the White House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment.

I had never thought however, that the Senator from Massachusetts would raise technicalities to defeat a good purpose. We all have the highest respect for the Senator from Massachusetts. We like him as a person. In his personal relations there is no one whom we trust more. We are delighted to have him as a friend, a relative, and a neighbor. The Senator from Massachusetts is one of the most estimable men I know. I hope very much that we will withdraw the technical point which he has raised, and return to the self we like to think of characterizing the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I cannot withdraw my point of order at this time in connection with this appropriation bill.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I inquired personally of a representative of the Bureau of the Budget on this subject today, and asked him about the letter which the official in charge of this subject, had written to the Senator from Illinois. He stated that there was simply not time to obtain from the various departments the data which might be necessary.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to join with him, through appropriation committee channels, in obtaining this information, and I certainly will try to see that we have it. I will try to see that the Senator from Washington, other members of the committee, and the Senator from Illinois have the information before the supplemental budget requests come before us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does the Senator object to my amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It would place an additional duty on the office of President. I do not believe such a formal characterization should apply to the office of President, any more than it applies in any other department.

We have the right to obtain this information, and, so far as I know, it will not be denied. The difficulty is that it could not be collected in time for the consideration of the pending bill. That is the best information I had, at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Library of Congress tried to obtain this material months ago, and was denied it. Six days ago the Senator from Illinois tried to obtain this information. We have been in almost constant telephonic communication with the Bureau of the Budget for the past few days. This is information which could be easily collected.

Information as to the military personnel who drive the automobiles for the President could be easily collected. To whom are they charged? Who pays for the airplanes? Who pays for the helicopters? Who pays for the boats? What about Camp David? All of this is accessible information, if there were the will to produce it. However, the Bureau of the Budget delays and postpones, in the hope that the people will forget about it. They are putting a curtain between this information and the American people. The Senator from Illinois, because of the technical point raised, has no recourse. By the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, he has been literally put off the court. But the American people will want to know. I predict that in a few days the information will be forced out. I hope the press of the country, which has been so anxious to get at senatorial payrolls—I have published mine and I was glad to to do so—will assert the right of the people to know about expenditures by the Executive.

Since the amendment has been ruled out of order, I send another amendment to the desk, which proposes to cut $300,000 in salaries. This cut could be made in the first place by dropping 5 supergrade personnel attached to the White House, by reducing the number from 20 to 15. That is six more than President Truman had. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "$2,221,-

000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,121,000."

On page 3, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$4,665,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,465,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The first item refers to the President directly. The second one refers to him indirectly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to have the amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The second item refers to the Bureau of the Budget. Both cuts could be made effective without any loss of efficiency. The amendment would reduce the number of supergrade personnel in the White House by 5 and in the Bureau of the Budget by 10. Their exit would take with them at least a $5,000 secretary for each one and probably more. This is a chance to save $300,000 for the hard-pressed taxpayers of the country. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Has the Chair announced the sufficiency for a yea-and-nay vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was not a sufficient second. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to rescinding the order for a quorum call?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To the request that the yeas and nays be ordered by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. Is there objection to the request to rescind the order for the quorum call? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That was a double-barreled request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will make it a single-barreled request. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection to the yeas and nays, but I will object to unanimous consent for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not intend to take any lengthy time on this amendment. For those who came into the Chamber late, the amendments would effect a saving of $100,000 in the Office of the President. This would be done by reducing the number of supergrade personnel from 20 to 15. There were only 9 in the last year of the Truman administration. It would also reduce the supergrade personnel in the Bureau of the Budget from 41 to 31 and save an additional $200,000, or a total of $300,000. There were only 14 supergrade positions in the Bureau of the Budget when Mr. Eisenhower took office. This would save money for the taxpayers by striking at the swollen bureaucracy of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who have come into the Chamber during the last few minutes, I should like to repeat the sentiment which was expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If the amendment should carry the precedent would be established that Congress would be attempting to tell the President of the United States how to conduct his office. The independence of the Executive in his office must be maintained, just as the independence of the judiciary and that of the legislative branch. It would be an unfortunate precedent if the Congress should start to set a limit upon the request of the President for salaries in his own office. The operation of the executive branch of the Government is different. This deals with the President's own office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I believe there is one thing which the Senate has done since I have been a Member of it, without advising and counseling with the President, and that is the matter of providing itself with the staff it needs and fixing the salaries on a basis it thinks equitable. There have been times when, if I could have brought about control of the President by the Senate, I would have done so. However, I would not do it by trying to fix a reasonable amount of salary for the employees he has. I would think that if we were going to take the position that we should determine that question for him, then we should permit him also to determine it for us. Having demonstrated our independence in that regard, I feel we cannot do any less than to extend to him the same privilege which we retain for ourselves.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 75, as follows:

YEAS—5

Carroll	Morse	Randolph
Douglas	Proxmire	

NAYS—75

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Allott	Gore	Martin
Anderson	Hart	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Morton
Bennett	Hayden	Moss
Bible	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Neuberger
Cannon	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Hruska	Prouty
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Church	Javits	Saltonstall
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Cotton	Jordan	Smathers
Curtis	Keating	Smith
Dirksen	Kefauver	Sparkman
Dodd	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Talmadge
Eastland	Lausche	Thurmond
Ellender	Long	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McNamara	Yarborough
Frear	Magnuson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Beall	Fulbright	McGee
Bridges	Green	Murray
Butler	Gruening	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy	Symington
Capehart	Langer	Wiley
Case, N.J.	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendments were rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, by this overwhelming vote, the Senate has clearly indicated that it is giving up its control over appropriations. It has previously established the precedent that any request approved by the House of Representatives in that body will not be scrutinized or changed by the Senate. The evidence also clearly shows that when the committees approved requests for expenditures to run the Sen-

ate, the Senate as a whole will not change them.

Now Senators are saying, in effect, that everything the President requests will be granted. In speech after speech it has been stated that the bureaus of the Government have made certain requests and commitments, and that therefore it is improper for Congress to make changes in the requested appropriations.

There now seems to have developed a decentralized process by means of which virtually every agency of the Government can determine what it will spend; and it seems to be regarded as improper for any Senator to question the amounts.

Mr. President, only five of us voted for economy in this budget. The defeat we experienced was an overwhelming one. I do not question the good faith of Senators who voted against us, because all of them are good Members of the Senate, and I am sure they voted with the highest of purposes.

I think the people of the country—those on the farms, those who sit quietly in their homes—are asking themselves, "Cannot economy be obtained somewhere? Do the executive, the President and Congress really mean business?"

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President; I do not yield at this time.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator from Illinois wants economy, will not he yield for a suggestion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me finish my remarks; and then I will yield to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, certainly the American people—those on the farms, those in the factories, those in the homes of the workingmen—are asking, "Cannot we have economy?"

Although we wish to take proper care of our President, I do not think we want him to live in Oriental splendor. I think that probably next to the Sheik of Saudi Arabia, we have now provided more liberally for the President of the United States than any ruler anywhere in the world has been provided for; and my belief that simplicity should attach to the office of the President is so strong that I definitely believe it is now time to make a change.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me now?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not yield at this time.

Mr. LONG. I do not blame the Senator from Illinois for not yielding, for he knows what is coming. But of course he can yield whenever he is ready. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we remember that when Thomas Jefferson was first inaugurated President of the United States, he rode on horseback to the foot of Capitol Hill, and then walked to the Capitol Building. But that is regarded as something in the past to which we should not return.

However, I wish to say that simplicity of life, economy, and frugality are still virtues in this country, even though they may be flouted by those in high office.

So, Mr. President, although the five of us were overwhelmingly repudiated here in the Senate, tonight, I do not think we shall be repudiated by the people of the country. And the Senator from Illinois, for one, intends—with good humor, but with persistence—to work for further economies in the budget.

Now I am delighted to yield to my good friend and needler from the State of Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me inform the Senators from Illinois that I am not here to needle. I am here to ask about important issues in the country, and particularly about what I regard as perhaps the most important one.

For 11 years the Senator from Illinois has been advocating "peanut" economies—for instance, when he advocated that free shaves for Senators be discontinued, and that they be made to pay 75 cents for shaves; or when he advocated taking the automobile away from the majority leader.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I never suggested the latter.

Mr. LONG. Or when he advocated taking the automobile away from the former President pro tempore, who then was 85 years of age.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I never suggested that.

Mr. LONG. Or when the Senator from Illinois advocated similar things; or when he advocated taking the rugs out of the new Senate Office Building.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I did suggest that or rather I proposed that they not be put in when there was no need for them.

Mr. LONG. Or when the Senator from Illinois proposed that the construction of the new subway be stopped 50 feet short of the Senate wing of the Capitol, with the result that Senators would have to run to this Chamber, regardless of the circumstances.

For instance, I recall that once, when a Senator was taking a bath, a vote was begun in this Chamber; and we had to wait until that Senator was able to use the subway and reach the floor. But under the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, the subway from the New Senate Office Building would stop 50 feet short of this building; and such a Senator would have to run all the way from the New Senate Office Building to the Senate Chamber, where he would arrive, no doubt, almost entirely out of breath—panting, perspiring, and in really quite a deplorable state.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President. I do not ask for that. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana; I would not have him taken off his feet.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois knows that—as compared to the "peanut" economies which he has advocated—a Government bond with a February 15, 1965, maturity date, which was issued at 2.58 percent interest, now sells at less than 90 percent par, with the result that it yields the purchaser 4.49 percent interest—on a U.S. Government bond—which is almost twice what such bonds were supposed to yield. The Senator from Illinois knows that previously we had a low interest rate—before the policy the Senator from Illinois has advocated went into effect and before he got his way.

Certainly the policy the Senator from Illinois has advocated is costing the Government $2 billion a year extra interest on the national debt; and that extra cost happens to be about 50 times as much as the total of all the "peanut" economies the Senator from Illinois has advocated here during the past several years.

The result of the policy the Senator from Illinois has advocated is that the people of the country are paying this extra interest rate, which operates as a tax on the poor, for the benefit of the rich, to the extent of $15 billion a year.

The Senator from Illinois has now said that that policy is no longer good and that he no longer advocates it. But our Republican friends will not let us forget about it. Every time we try to say that policy is unwise, they read the statements the Senator from Illinois made, to prove from the words of a good, loyal Democratic Senator that that was a fine policy and that it should have been instituted. They say the policy should be continued, and they urge the logic of the Senator from Illinois.

If the Senator from Illinois will go to the repenters' bench, and will say, "I was wrong. I never was right. I made a very bad mistake, and it is costing the Government a fortune. It is a $15 billion hidden tax on the poor, for the benefit of the rich. And I am sorry I ever did it," then I am willing to vote with him for some of his "peanut" economies. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has made one of his typically effective speeches. His speech reminds me of the character, Mr. Dick, in Dickens' novel "David Copperfield," who, whenever he discussed any subject, had to bring the head of King Charles into the discussion.

No matter what subject we discuss, the Senator from Louisiana will bring up the interest rate; and he always will try to fasten around the neck of the Senator from Illinois responsibility for the increase in the interest rate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me reply to the Senator from Louisiana; and then I shall yield.

Mr. President, I do not intend to go into that issue and discuss it at length at this time. However, I have moved for some very major economies as well as small ones, such as the $1 billion cut I proposed in the Commodity Credit Corporation funds a few days ago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question—just a question, now?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I ask the Senator from Louisiana to wait a minute, please.

What I was trying to establish in 1950 and 1951 was a competitive interest rate, so that the Federal Government would not compel the Federal Reserve Board to purchase Government bonds at interest rates below the competitive rate, because in so doing the Reserve Banks increased their member bank reserves, which in turn permitted an approximately sixfold multiplication of bank credit, and contributed to inflation.

The Senator from Illinois was correct in that policy. He had some part in effecting the change.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed of that. I am very proud of it. I am not going to sit on the sinner's bench, at all.

But I do say that now this administration is trying to force upon the public an uncompetitive interest rate, and is trying artificially to raise the interest rate, whereas the Truman administration tried artificially to lower the interest rate.

The Senator from Illinois is standing for, and is urging, a competitive interest rate. That is what he is seeking to establish. He believes it is not necessary to increase the interest rate above 4¼ percent.

I shall be glad to argue this point at length on another occasion, Mr. President. But at this time, when the Senate is ready to vote, I do not propose to let the Senator from Louisiana come on the floor and launch into a rhodomontade and attack me.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to ask me a question, of course I will yield.

Mr. LONG. Has not the Senator from Illinois heard his statement read out of context at least half a dozen times, to support an erroneous policy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has been pained to find that the Republican Secretaries of the Treasury think he is a great fiscal authority when his views happen to correspond to theirs, but that they denounce him as wild-eyed when his views differ from theirs. When George M. Humphrey, formerly the Secretary of the Treasury, and when the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, say I am a fiscal authority, I am ready to admit it, if they insist on it. And I am ready to say that their present policies are unsound and, furthermore, that the administration is trying to throttle appropriations for human welfare, by advocating reductions in appropriations which the Congress should make to help the health and the housing of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, Mr. President, I am torn between a desire to——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am one of the five. [Laughter.] So will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well; I yield with pleasure.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of my colleagues for a brief comment.

In the mountains of West Virginia, where there continues to be a considerable lumbering industry, we do not expect a man with an ax to fell a tree with one blow. And I declare to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that I would not criticize him; rather, I would commend him for his continual chipping away on these unwarranted expenditures. Certainly, the White House must maintain a consistent attitude toward a better balancing of the budget.

Mr. President, we are in good humor in this discussion but actually, my fellow colleagues, this is a basic rule of sound action.

Kin Hubbard, the cracker-barrel philosopher, wrote many years ago:

I don't believe in kickin';
It ain't like to bring one peace.
But the wheel that squeaks the loudest
Is the one that gets the grease.

I hope the Senator will pursue his "kickin'," and I will stand with him on issues of this type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the courageous Senator from West Virginia. I have one other amendment, which I send to the desk. I shall not ask for a yea and nay vote on this amendment, because I know what its fate would be, but I wish to have it made a matter of record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 2, line 25, to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,125,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Bureau of the Budget, which says there is not money enough to aid education, not money enough to safeguard health, not money enough for housing, not money enough to take care of the needs of the American people, has done very well by itself. Instead of having 14 supergrade positions, as it had in the last year of the Truman administration, it now has 41 supergrade positions. While receiving comfortable salaries, they try to cut down on the needs of the poor. I am proposing that we cut the mysterious special projects appropriation by $375,000. Some of these people work very closely with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I do not ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will not, however, shun a yea-and-nay vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has there been a request for the yeas and nays? There has been no such request.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was one of the five who voted with the Senator from Illinois on the last vote. I did not fully agree with my distinguished colleague from Illinois, but I did not want to see him standing there alone. [Laughter.] It is a privilege, also, to associate myself with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] in his cogent observations.

I want to say now to my distinguished colleague from Illinois I do not think the Bureau of the Budget needs fewer employees. It needs more. What is needed even more is more control by the Congress. I see present the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. He could tell Senators about the Bureau of the Budget.

This is the doctrine I have been trying to teach in my limited experience in this body. The Bureau of the Budget is determining what appropriations the executive branch will request of Congress. It is the one conducting investigations into the executive branch and into the regulatory bodies. We know our own committees are not following through.

I may say to my friend from Illinois he made a fine move toward economy, and I supported him, as a symbol, on the last vote, and only as a symbol, because I did not want him to stand with so few Senators supporting him. I did not quite agree with the Senator, but I did not want him to stand alone.

On the amendment now before the Senate, I think the Senator from Illinois is wrong. I think the Bureau of the Budget needs more personnel, more competent personnel, more salaries. But, more than that, the Congress of the United States needs larger staffs. We are the ones who ought to be staffing ourselves. We are the ones who ought to be spending money to check the Bureau of the Budget and find out what it is doing, so the legislative branch can regain control of the purse strings.

With all due deference to the Senator from Illinois, I hope this amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement and several exhibits which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

THE WHITE HOUSE AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUDGET—THE RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

I wish to point out some of the waste and excesses in the budget of the White House and of the Executive Office of the President. There will be those who will say that a Member of the Senate should not criticize the President's personal budget; that it is above criticism or beyond the pale of congressional approval or disapproval. I do not share this point of view and I believe that my past actions make it possible for me to criticize

the waste and extravagance in the President's personal budget.

In the first place, my colleagues will recall that when President Truman was in office, I rose time and again on the floor of the Senate to offer amendments to cut his budget. At that time, I was often joined by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. However, since a member of their own party has occupied the White House, they have been strangely silent on the increases in the costs, personnel and perquisites of that office. I can only conclude that they operate on a double standard and apply a different set of values to Democratic waste or extravagance than to Republican waste and extravagance.

Not only are they silent in their criticism of Eisenhower waste, but when such issues are raised by members of my party, they appear indignant that anyone would have the temerity to raise such issues or to criticize their President. Their actions make me feel like approving the famous statement that the British journalist, Labouchere, made about Prime Minister Gladstone—and which more often than not, is inadvertently attributed to Disraeli—namely, that while he did not object to Mr. Gladstone always having the aces up his sleeve, what he did object to was Mr. Gladstone's insistence that the good Lord put them there.

In the second place, some may remember that I have also criticized actions of the Congress in supplying what I believe to be unnecessary perquisites to ourselves—perquisites which include free haircuts, subsidized meals, unneeded carpets, and the building of tunnels which seems to go nowhere.

For these reason, my conscience is clear and I believe that the budget of the President and the White House should receive the same scrutiny and evaluation that should properly be applied to all other matters of budgets and expenditures.

Furthermore, the White House and the Republican National Committee, as well as some of our colleagues in this body, have been waging a campaign against a wild-spending Congress.

The truth, however, is quite different. In these last 4 years, a Democratic Congress has cut the President's budget and his requests—including supplemental requests—by about $8 billion. In the 85th Congress, we cut his requests—including supplementals—by some $5.6 billion. In the 84th Congress, we cut his requests—including the supplementals which he also requested—by some $2.3 billion, or a total of $8 billion.

When these facts are given, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle reply that while this is true, we have nonetheless provided for back-door financing which is the reason that the budget was unbalanced, even though we cut it drastically. However, they fail to point out that in almost every case of so-called back-door financing, the President has requested such financing or has included such financing in the bills which he has sent to us, or has signed them into law. In fact, we have only just seen the example of the President requesting some $4.5 billion in back-door financing for the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and back-door financing for the latter sent to us in such a way that it would add to the deficit in fiscal year 1959 when it is not to be spent, but not to the fiscal 1960 budget when it is to be spent.

There is another fact about which they are strangely silent, namely, the tremendous deficits which have been piled up under the Eisenhower administration. Under this administration, we have had the largest peacetime deficit in our history. Under this administration, we have been asked to increase the debt ceiling on no less than three occasions, the last at this very moment. Under this administration, the total deficits have amounted to $25.1 billion and have been offset by budget surpluses of only $3.1 billion, leaving a net deficit for 6 years of $22.1 billion. In the 6½ peacetime years Mr. Truman was in office, there were total deficits of $14.4 billion which were offset by surpluses of $11.9 billion, leaving a net deficit of only $2.5 billion. This almost tenfold increase in the budget deficits under President Eisenhower are facts about which the President and his supporters say very little when they charge us Democrats with being wild spenders.

Since the President and his agents have determined to make the spending theme their 1960 campaign issue, it is not unfair to ask that the President should practice what he preaches and work a little harder to set his own house in order. This I intend to help him do today, for he needs our help in this matter. I want him to be just as frugal as he and his party claim he wants to be, or claims that others should be.

Increases in the budget of the White House and the Executive Office of the President

A. The White House Staff

Since 1952, there has been an increase in the White House staff—exclusive of personnel for the Executive Mansion and grounds and White House Police—of 112 positions. In 1952, the number of positions was 262 and the appropriation was $1,883,615. In 1960, the President has requested 373 positions and an appropriation of $3,721,000. This is an increase of 43 percent in the number of personnel and of almost 50 percent in the dollar costs of the staff of the White House office itself, exclusive of maintenance personnel, police and those in the Executive Office. When these figures are examined, it will be seen that this increase has come about by the addition of 11 persons to the White House staff, plus an additional 101 positions for so-called special projects of the President.

When this increase has been pointed out, the administration says it is unfair to count the special projects, but that is where the increases have been and my judgment is that they have been termed "special projects" in order to avoid criticism. Their argument is something like that of the excuse of Rip Van Winkle who, having sworn off the bottle, exclaimed as he lifted the glass to his lips, "We won't count this one." But nonetheless, there are 101 special positions which are a part of the White House office and which have added considerably to the cost of the White House itself.

Others may say that all of this can be explained away by the overall increase in the cost of living and the increase in the functions of the President. However, since the President has come into office, the cost of living index has risen from an index number of 113.5 in 1952 to an index number of 124.0, or by 10.5 points, or 9.2 percent. The rise in the cost of living of 9.2 percent hardly accounts for the 43 percent increase in the personnel and the almost 50 percent increase in the cost of the White House office itself.

When, in addition to this, the personnel of the Executive Mansion and grounds, who number 72, and the White House police, who number 170, are added to these totals, we see that the number of employees at the White House, in addition to the President and the White House office, have increased from 502 positions in 1952 to 615 positions requested for 1960, and that the dollar amounts have increased from $3 million in 1952 to $5.4 million requested in 1960. Thus, here is a place where the President could make a good start in proving to the country how sincere he is in wanting to cut down on waste and extravagance.

B. The White House and Executive Office of the President

The Office of the President includes numerous other personnel who are counted as a part of the Executive Office of the President and who are there because they serve the President in his various functions. There has also been a considerable increase in these numbers. The table below gives these facts and figures.

Comparison of personnel in the Executive Office of the President, 1952 and 1960

Item	1952	1960	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
President	1	1	
White House Office	261	272	+11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	72	+1
White House Police	170	170	
Bureau of the Budget	515	435	−80
Council of Economic Advisers	47	31	−16
Emergency fund for the President	82	5	−77
National Security Council	23	77	+54
National Security Resources Board	135		−135
Office of Defense Mobilization	199		−199
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,175	1,768	+593
Special projects		101	+101
President's Advisory Committee on Government Operations		5	+5
President's Committee on Fund Raising in the Federal Service		4	+4
Total	2,679	2,941	+262

This table is taken from the House hearings on this bill, page 139. However, to make it comparable, I have added to the number of positions under President Truman the figure of 1,175 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration for the year 1952 which, when added to those at the ODM and National Security Resources Board in 1952, is a comparable figure with the 1,768 positions under the new Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in 1960. Thus, I have bent over backward to make this a fair comparison and one which compares the actual functions in the Executive Office in 1960 with those same functions—in or out of the Executive Office—in 1952. Here, too, then, is a place where the President could begin to practice what he preaches.

C. Increase in Top Flight and Super Grade Personnel

The question may be asked, What accounts for the large increase in the number and appropriations for the White House Office and the Executive Offices of the President? In particular, what accounts for the increased appropriations for some agencies, like that of the Bureau of the Budget, where, in fact, the number of people has decreased since 1952?

The answer to that question lies largely in the large increase in the number of supergrade personnel or topflight personnel which this administration has added at the White House and in the Bureau of the Budget. These are the personnel who are paid from $14,000 up to $22,500 per year. Let us first

examine the increase of these personnel in the White House Office.

In 1952, President Truman had on the staff of the White House Office, eight topflight or special positions and one supergrade position, or for a total of nine. In the 1960 budget, the President is asking for 14 special positions and for 6 supergrade positions, or for a total of 20. Thus, there has been an increase in these topflight positions of from 9, under Mr. Truman, to 20 under Mr. Eisenhower. Now, I know that Mr. Eisenhower probably needs more high-priced help than did Mr. Truman, but I would think that this increase of 11, or of 122 percent, is excessive. I should think that he might be able to get along with only a 50-percent increase in these positions, and I would suggest that the numbers be reduced from 20 to 15, which would still leave him with an increase of 66 percent.

The Bureau of the Budget has had a decrease in personnel of from 515 positions under President Truman to 435 positions under President Eisenhower, or a total of 80 positions, yet their budget has increased from $3.6 million in 1952 to $4.7 million in 1960, or by $1.1 million or by 30 percent. I suspect, also, that some of the functions which were performed by the Bureau of the Budget under President Truman have been transferred to other agencies or to other people in the Executive Office. But, let us take the figures as they have been given.

How does one account for this 30-percent increase in appropriations when there has been a decrease in the numbers employed. Again, it is a great deal more than the increase in the cost of living. But the secret lies, in part, in the great increase in the number of topflight or supergrade positions under the Eisenhower administration.

When President Eisenhower came into Office, there were at the Bureau of the Budget, 12 supergrade employees and two special positions, or a total of 14 topflight positions. In the 1960 budget, the President and the Budget Bureau are asking for 36 supergrade positions and for 5 special positions, or a total of 41 topflight positions which carry salaries from $14,000 and above to a top of $22,500. This is a 300-percent increase in the number of these topflight positions.

I would think that we could cut at least 10 of these positions, thus reducing the number of topflight positions to 31, still leaving the Budget Bureau with an increase in topflight positions of 220 percent over the number which President Truman had.

I think that in view of the increase in the yearly budgets, which are now in the range of $77 to $80 billion per year, and of the tremendous increase in the deficits under this administration which have been, on net, some $22.5 billion, that a 220-percent increase may be needed. But I do not think that a 300-percent increase in the topflight positions at the Budget Bureau are at all necessary.

In fact, if the President were ever to have carried out his campaign pledge—made at Morningside Heights—to reduce our annual budgets to the general level of about $60 billion per year, then, of course, he would probably have not needed this high-priced help in the Budget Bureau. But, they do have their problems in the increased amounts which they recommend that we spend, and they also have the problem of the huge deficits which have come about, including the largest deficit in any peacetime year, so that I think I am being fair when I say that a 220-percent increase in their topflight personnel should be adequate. In fact, if we reduce these numbers as I am proposing, perhaps we might see a proportionate reduction in the size of the budget and the size of the deficits, for, at the moment at least, there seems to be some direct relationship between the increase in topflight personnel and the increase in both budget expenditures and the size of the deficits.

D. The Perquisites of the President

In addition to all of these expenses and expenditures, there are the perquisites of the President which, unfortunately, are now shown in the budget of the White House or Executive Office, for—in the most part—they are charged to other appropriations and to other accounts and do not show up in the White House budget.

These perquisites, which he has at his personal disposal or which are provided to the White House staff and those in the Executive Office, include a fleet of eight limousines at the White House itself—which include a 7-passenger Cadillac, a bubbletop Lincoln costing about $30,000, and a Chrysler Imperial equipped with a sliding roof. In addition, there are two more heavily constructed Cadillacs costing about $65,000 which are occupied by the Secret Service. Then, also, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization also have limousines provided to them. Thus, the number of limousines alone come to a total of 12 which are used at the White House or for the President and his agents. Attached to these, of course, are military personnel who function in the capacity of chauffeurs.

In addition to this, the President will have available to him three new Boeing 707 jet airliners—two of which have already been delivered—costing $4.7 million each.

Furthermore, the President has at his disposal two 6-passenger Aero-Commanders and two helicopters which are provided alternatively by the services.

One must also remember that he has at his disposal two naval vessels, the *Barbara Ann* and the *Susie E*, which cost about $140,000 and $35,000 each to recondition. Of course, the President has at his disposal the crews and personnel for these perquisites, as well as the ground crews in the case of his planes.

Even a motorized golf cart appears to be provided for him out of the funds of the Treasury. The cost of the golf cart is estimated at about $1,000 and requires a driver, a function performed by the Secret Service.

The Library of Congress has prepared a very interesting memorandum on these perquisites, which appear on pages 128–129 of the House hearings.

It reads as follows:

"[From the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, Washington, D.C.]

"COMPARATIVE COST DATA ON THE PRESIDENCY AND FUNCTIONS RELATING THERETO, FISCAL YEARS 1938–60

"The Federal cost of maintaining the President, the White House, and his staff has shown a marked increase over the past two decades. Today, the support of this growing establishment necessitates the employment of hundreds of persons and annual outlays running into millions of dollars.

"Data showing this upward trend in congressional appropriations approved for the compensation of the President, the upkeep of the Executive Mansion, the White House staff, and related agencies for every year from 1938 to date are given in the tables appended to this report.

"President Eisenhower receives an annual compensation of $150,000. This includes his salary of $100,000 plus a $50,000 expense allowance. In addition, an allowance of $40,000 is available to pay the President's travel expenses as well as certain entertainment expenses. Presidential remuneration today is just twice that received by President Roosevelt 20 years ago.

"The cost of the upkeep of the Executive Mansion and grounds costs the Federal Government half a million dollars annualy. For the fiscal year 1959 Congress appropriated $515,000 for the care and operation of the Executive Mansion and grounds. This compares with $335,600 provided for the fiscal year 1952, the last year of President Truman's administration, and $210,098 voted for President Roosevelt in 1938. As can be seen in table 3 the greater portion of the total has been for payment for personal services. At the present time there are some 72 persons on the staff of the Executive Mansion. Thirty-four are servants, while the remaining 38 are engineers, carpenters, painters, electricians, gardeners, etc. This total is about the same number as those employed during the last year of President Truman's administration, but represents an increase of 16 over the number maintained at the end of President Roosevelt's administration. Detailed information on the number of persons employed in the Executive Mansion, their occupation and salary appears from time to time in hearings conducted by the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees. Table 4 gives this detail for 1938, 1951, and 1959.

"Salaries and expenses of the White House staff exceed $2 million a year. The $2,052,000 appropriated for the fiscal year 1959 is $168,000 more than that provided for fiscal year 1952 and is nearly seven times that voted for President Roosevelt's staff in 1940. Again personal services account for the major portion of this total. Obligations for personal services are estimated at $1,947,165, in the budget for 1960. This is 13 times the amount obligated in the fiscal year 1938. Included also under this appropriation is the $40,000 travel expense fund for the President. Table 6 gives a detailed breakdown of obligations for the White House office staff from 1938 to date.

"The latest Federal budget requests 272 positions for the White House staff in 1960. This compares with 261 in 1952 and 45 in 1938.

"In addition, $1,500,000 has been requested for fiscal year 1960 for the services of 101 persons hired for special White House projects. This staff gives special assistance to the President on particular problems of public policy.

"The U.S. Secret Service, operating under the Treasury Department, is responsible for guarding the President, his family, and the Executive Mansion and grounds. The budget for the fiscal year 1960 asks for $1,055,000 to pay the salaries and expenses of 170 White House police. This amount is seven times the $150,650 provided in 1938 and nearly twice the $652,000 voted in 1952. While the number employed today is about the same as in 1952, it is almost three times that required in 1938. These data cover only the police required for the protection of the White House and grounds. Excluded are the police employed for the personal protection of the President and his family. We have been advised that funds for this purpose cannot be segregated from the general salaries and expenses of the U.S. Secret Service.

"The funds appropriated for the immediate support of the President and his staff along with the persons employed in 1938, in the last year of President Truman's administration and the most recent request for the Eisenhower administration, is summarized as follows:

	"1938		1952		1960 (requested)	
	Appropriations	Number of positions	Appropriations	Number of positions	Appropriations	Number of positions
Compensation of the President	$75,000		$150,000		$150,000	
White House office	211,380	45	1,883,615	261	[1] 3,721,000	[1] 373
Executive Mansion and grounds	210,098	57	335,600	71	475,000	72
White House Police	150,650	60	652,000	170	1,055,000	170
Total	647,128	162	3,021,215	502	5,401,000	615

[1] Includes special projects carried on by the White Honse.

"It may be seen from this table that the Presidency today necessitates a minimum annual outlay of $5 million and a staff of more than 600 persons.

"This does not include the numerous agencies which act in an advisory capacity and are directly responsible to the President. Such agencies include the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, etc. Appropriations amounting to $97,226,000 were requested for the fiscal year 1960 for the entire Executive Office of the President. By far the largest portion of this is for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization which asks $86,970,000 for the coming fiscal year. It is difficult to accurately compare the growth of the entire Executive Office of the President because of the constant addition of new agencies or the transfer or abolition of existing ones. Detailed information on appropriations and employees of most of the agencies included under the Executive Office of the President since 1938 is given in the tables included in the appendix. Excluded are the temporary agencies which were set up during World War II.

"Thus for all of the information presented is that which is readily available in appropriations hearings and in the annual volumes of the Federal budget. There are additional costs of the Presidency which are included in budgets of other Federal agencies. Our office has attempted to obtain official data from the White House on such Presidential expenses chargeable to other budget accounts, but to date this information has not been made available.

"However, newspaper and magazine articles have appeared from time to time giving certain cost data on the planes, boats, cars, etc. of the President. Summarized below are the data which have appeared within the last 2 years on this subject.

"President Eisenhower has at his disposal a fleet of limousines, planes, helicopters, two cabin cruisers, a modern Executive Mansion in Washington and a mountain lodge in the Catoctin Mountains in Maryland—all supported out of Federal taxes.

"The air fleet available for the President's use consists of a four-engine Super Constellation, two six-passenger Aero-Commanders and a number of helicopters. In addition, three Boeing 707 jet airliners are on order for use by the President, high-ranking officials and heads of state.

"The Super Constellation *Columbine III* transports the President and his staff on long-distance flights. This plane cost in the neighborhood of $3 million. The White House reports the following crew members: pilot, copilot, navigator, radio operator, 2 flight engineers, 3 stewards, 8 airmen, and security guards, and 11 mechanics and ground maintenance men—a total crew of 28. The Air Force reports that the cost per hour of running this plane is approximately $711.

"Two 6-passenger Aero-Commanders, costing $75,000 each, are available for trips of a few hundred miles. These planes are furnished by the Air Force on short notice. The only cost data available are those reported in 1957. Press Secretary, James C. Hagerty, is reported to have made the statement at that time that it cost between $30 and $35 an hour to operate these planes. This estimate excludes the salaries of the Air Force personnel used to operate them.

"Also at the President's disposal are 12-passenger S–58 helicopters provided in pairs by the Army and Marine Corps.

"U.S. News & World Report in a very recent article estimated that one of the new jet airliners would cost in the neighborhood of $4.7 million.

"It is reported that at least 20 cars are rented on a regular basis for use by the President and his staff. Additional vehicles are made available when the need arises. The President is reported to use three cars: A recent-model Cadillac, a bubbletop Lincoln costing about $30,000, and a Chrysler Imperial equipped with a sliding roof. Two heavily constructed Cadillacs costing about $65,000 each are occupied by Secret Service men who accompany the President. The Army furnishes chauffeurs for this fleet of cars.

"President Eisenhower also has the use of a motorized golf car which cost approximately $1,000. It is driven by a Secret Service man.

"The Ferdinand Magellan, a private railroad car, was formerly available for the President to use on his cross-country tours. The Federal Government purchased it in 1946 for $1. Its value was estimated in 1957 at $200,000. It is understood that President Eisenhower no longer uses this means of transportation.

"The yacht, *Williamsburg*, formerly used by President Truman, was inactivated in 1953 at the request of President Eisenhower. The Navy Department advises that it is not used for anything now, but is held in the reserve fleet at New London, Conn. During the years of its operation it was manned by 8 officers and 156 men and cost $186,000 annually to operate, exclusive of the salaries of the personnel on board. The Navy reports that it is not feasible to segregate the salaries of the Naval personnel used on this yacht from other salary data.

"In place of the *Williamsburg*, President Eisenhower has the use of two naval vessels, the *Barbara Ann* and the *Susie E*, named after two of his granddaughters. The 92-foot *Barbara Ann* cost about $140,000 to recondition, and the 60-foot *Susie E*, about $35,000. No information on operating costs of these vessels has been obtainable to date from either the Navy Department or the White House. U.S. News & World Report in 1957 estimated that it would take at least $500,000 to duplicate these vessels today. It also estimated that the Navy spends approximately $60,000 each year for their maintenance.

"In addition to the Executive Mansion, the President has the use of Camp David, a mountain retreat in the Catoctin Mountains in Maryland. It was built during World War II as a refuge for President Roosevelt. It was named "Shangri La" by President Roosevelt, but was renamed 'Camp David' after President Eisenhower's grandson. No cost data on Camp David has been obtainable thus far, either from the White House or from the Navy Department which is responsible for Camp David's administration.

"APPENDIX

"BUDGET REQUESTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS, APPROPRIATIONS APPROVED, AND TOTAL POSITIONS OF THE WHITE HOUSE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEARS 1938-60

"TABLE 1.—*Compensation of the President*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved
1938	$75,000	$75,000
1939	75,000	75,000
1940	75,000	75,000
1941	75,000	75,000
1942	75,000	75,000
1943	75,000	75,000
1944	75,000	75,000
1945	75,000	75,000
1946	75,000	75,000
1947	75,000	75,000
1948	75,000	75,000
1949	75,000	108,438
1950	75,000	150,000
1951	150,000	150,000
1952	150,000	150,000
1953	150,000	150,000
1954	150,000	150,000
1955	150,000	150,000
1956	150,000	150,000
1957	150,000	150,000
1958	150,000	150,000
1959	150,000	150,000
1960	150,000	

NOTE.—Except where noted, budget requests represent the original request for appropriations carried in the budget document for the years given.

"TABLE 2.—*Executive Mansion and grounds*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1938	$143,098	$210,098	57
1939	146,750	146,750	61
1940	146,750	146,750	63
1941	152,750	202,750	63
1942	150,670	150,670	63
1943	145,570	145,570	58
1944	151,500	151,500	59
1945	150,000	150,000	56
1946	150,000	[1] 1,871,940	49
1947	184,000	202,250	56
1948	202,250	202,250	57
1949	230,700	244,200	61
1950	260,400	260,400	61
1951	266,000	266,000	61
1952	315,600	335,600	71
1953	367,200	366,700	72
1954	367,200	356,184	72
1955	366,200	372,197	72
1956	366,200	383,775	72
1957	383,775	383,775	72
1958	400,400	415,000	72
1959	[2] 449,400	515,000	[3] 72
1960	475,000		[3] 72

[1] $1,650,000 of this total was for addition to the Executive Mansion.
[2] Includes supplemental request of $34,000 for fiscal year 1959 presented in the 1960 Federal budget.
[3] Estimated.

"TABLE 3.—*Executive Mansion and grounds, obligations by object, fiscal years 1938–60*

Fiscal year	Personal services	Transportation of things	Communication services	Rents and utility services	Printing and reproduction	Other contractual services	Supplies and materials	Equipment	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	Taxes and assessments	Repairs and alterations	Travel	Land and structures	Special and miscellaneous	Total obligations
1938	$105,125	$11	$552	$11,057			$8,998	$24,241			$54,526	$18		$5,570	$210,098
1939	98,337	20	628	11,180			14,876	11,630			4,300	60		4,759	145,790
1940	103,750	24	603	11,558			12,297	7,180			6,262	48		5,028	146,750
1941	104,106	49	666	11,774			14,882	18,098			32,509	28		5,570	187,682
1942	112,403	22	223	12,420		$8,207	19,157	5,441				5			157,878
1943	101,968	14	144	13,268	$70	11,073	14,932	1,394							142,773
1944	105,834	4	140	12,706	17	8,561	17,570	4,163							148,995
1945	106,300	3	145	12,127		12,983	17,739	703							150,000
1946	114,723	8	140	12,723	66	11,939	25,707	6,652							171,958
1947	164,385	329	76	12,416	97	44,921	38,196	13,545				108	$83,602		357,675
1948	155,604	46	64	13,387	85	101,616	79,881	11,314					13,839		375,836
1949	173,017	30	64	13,892	125	18,358	33,701	4,713				43			243,943
1950	193,774			12,635	154	13,840	25,307	37,408				41			283,159
1951	208,400	49		13,607	640	6,180	32,233	21,988		$73					283,170
1952	253,470	54		17,623	26	20,804	63,779	2,573		147		85	6,986		365,547
1953	287,586	8		27,315	272	13,546	48,765	2,700		85		29			380,306
1954	280,964			28,766	39	52,798	37,750	881		69			42,411		443,678
1955	278,870	9		28,327	159	27,268	53,298	4,367		41					392,339
1956	283,802	34		29,366	40	26,560	46,158	4,125		114				821	391,020
1957	297,335	23	4	34,412	40	20,139	50,409	1,078		207			19,728		423,375
1958	316,692	80		36,460	130	14,287	30,547	274	$16,564	170				[1] 3,946	419,150
1959 (est.)	320,956		145	30,890	125	42,100	48,575	11,984	16,625				14,000	−3,946	481,454
1960 (est.)	362,581			34,890	125	26,100	47,175	7,984	20,000	145			6,000		505,000

[1] 1959 program obligated in 1958. Source: 'The Budget of the U.S. Government,' annual volumes for the years 1940 through 1960. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

"TABLE 4.—*Executive Mansion and grounds—Detail of personal services in selected fiscal years*

	Number of positions	Salaries
1938		
Assistant engineer	1.0	$2,900
Senior foreman gardener (at $2,250)	2.0	4,500
Gardener (at $1,545)	4.0	6,180
Assistant gardener	1.0	1,380
Housekeeper	.5	1,650
Administrative assistant	1.0	2,000
Clerk	1.0	1,620
Receiving clerk and accountant	.5	840
Assistant mechanical superintendent	1.0	2,500
Senior mechanic (at $2,200)	2.0	4,400
Mechanic (at $1,860)	3.0	5,580
Junior mechanic	1.0	1,560
Cook	1.0	1,620
Housekeeper	.5	840
Butler	1.0	1,620
Butler (at $1,380)	2.0	2,760
Messenger (at $1,470)	2.0	2,940
Footman	1.0	1,320
Mechanic's helper (at $1,440)	3.0	4,320
Valet	1.0	1,380
Cook	1.0	1,320
Pantryman	1.0	1,380
Assistant storekeeper	1.0	1,440
Doorman	1.0	1,260
Senior laborer (at $1,425)	8.0	11,400
Butler (at $1,260)	2.0	2,520
Housemen (at $1,160)	3.0	3,480
Cook (at $1,080)	2.0	2,160
Kitchen helpers	1.0	1,080
Laborer (at $1,080)	2.0	2,160
Maid (at $996)	5.0	4,980
Total	56.5	85,090
1951		
Principal operating engineer	1.0	4,525
Operating engineer (at $3,325)	4.0	13,300
Foreman carpenter	1.0	4,525
Carpenter (at $3,380)	3.0	10,140
Carpenter	1.0	3,140
Carpenter's helper	1.0	2,770
Foreman electrician	1.0	4,525
Electrician	1.0	4,150
Do	1.0	3,140
Foreman gardener	1.0	4,525
Gardener	1.0	3,725
Do	1.0	3,460
Gardener (at $3,275)	2.0	6,550
Gardener	1.0	3,050
Gardener (at $2,930)	3.0	8,790
Gardener	1.0	2,850
Do	1.0	2,530
Foreman plumber	1.0	3,900
Plumber	1.0	3,140
Painter	1.0	3,625
Storekeeper	1.0	3,725
Assistant storekeeper	1.0	3,115

"TABLE 4.—*Executive Mansion and grounds—Detail of personal services in selected fiscal years*—Continued

	Number of positions	Salaries
1951		
Maintenance foreman	1.0	$3,625
Clerk	1.0	2,955
Housekeeper	1.0	4,325
Maitre de hotel	1.0	4,325
1st butler	1.0	3,140
2d butler	1.0	2,914
Butler	1.0	2,450
1st cook	1.0	3,140
2d cook	1.0	2,914
Cook (at $2,770)	2.0	5,540
Cook	1.0	2,652
Do	1.0	2,530
Doorman	1.0	2,850
Do	1.0	2,732
Do	1.0	2,652
Do	1.0	2,120
Houseman	1.0	2,732
Do	1.0	2,652
Do	1.0	2,540
Do	1.0	2,470
Do	1.0	2,260
Do	1.0	2,190
Do	1.0	2,120
Housemaid	1.0	2,470
Housemaid (at ($2,400)	3.0	7,200
Housemaid	1.0	2,120
Messenger	1.0	2,930
Valet	1.0	2,850
Total	61.0	188,598
1959 (estimated)		
Principal operating engineer	1.0	5,645
Operating engineer	7.0	30,425
Foreman of carpenters	1.0	5,645
Assistant foreman of carpenters	2.0	9,860
Carpenter	3.0	12,415
Foreman of painters	1.0	5,240
Foreman electrician	1.0	5,645
Electrician	3.0	14,030
Foreman plumber	1.0	5,240
Plumber	2.0	9,100
Plumber's helper	1.0	3,345
Foreman gardener	1.0	5,645
Gardener	11.0	39,465
Storekeeper	1.0	5,025
Assistant storekeeper	1.0	4,010
Clerk	1.0	3,415
Maitre d'hotel	1.0	5,375
Housekeeper	1.0	5,375
Assistant housekeeper	1.0	3,940
1st butler	1.0	4,010
2d butler	1.0	3,515
Butler	2.0	6,415
Head cook	1.0	4,215
2d cook	1.0	3,670
Cook	4.0	12,690
Valet	1.0	2,960
Doormen	5.0	16,515

"TABLE 4.—*Executive Mansion and grounds—Detail of personal services in selected fiscal years*—Continued

	Number of positions	Salaries
1959 (estimated)—Con.		
Foreman-houseman	1.0	$3,670
Housemen	4.0	12,375
Head laundress	1.0	3,130
Pantrywoman	1.0	2,775
Maids	8.0	23,660
Total	72.0	278,440

Source: 'The budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal year 1940, Washington.' U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939, p. 25. U.S. Congress. House Committee on Appropriations. Hearings. Independent Offices Appropriations for 1952. 82d Cong., 1st sess. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951, p. 6; 'General Government Matters Appropriations for 1959.' 85th Cong., 2d sess. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 135.

"TABLE 5.—*White House Office*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1938	[1] $211,380	[1] $211,380	45
1939	[1] 213,160	[1] 213,160	45
1940	[1] 214,200	312,200	63
1941	305,500	305,500	63
1942	307,560	307,560	48
1943	308,910	308,910	47
1944	302,190	302,190	48
1945	339,131	353,631	49
1946	313,038	342,588	52
1947	883,660	883,660	210
1948	1,452,500	952,500	288
1949	969,612	1,169,612	241
1950	1,375,140	1,375,140	238
1951	1,585,553	1,585,553	254
1952	1,883,615	1,883,615	261
1953	1,907,643	1,957,643	279
1954	1,904,790	1,800,000	246
1955	1,800,000	1,895,000	262
1956	1,882,500	1,882,500	271
1957	1,875,000	1,875,000	268
1958	2,051,970	2,052,000	270
1959	[2] 2,151,970	2,052,000	[3] 272
1960	2,221,000		272

[1] Represents funds for salaries, Executive Office; contingent expenses, Executive Office; printing and binding and traveling expenses of the President. In later years these accounts are consolidated under the heading 'White House Office.'

[2] Includes supplemental request of $100,000 for the fiscal year 1959 presented in the 1960 Federal budget.

[3] Estimated.

"TABLE 6.—*The White House Office—Obligations by object, fiscal years 1938–60*

Fiscal year	Personal services	Travel expenses of the President	Other travel	Communication services	Rents and utilities	Printing and reproduction	Other contractual services	Supplies and materials	Equipment	Grants, subsidies, contributions	Taxes and assessments	Total obligations
1938	$144,299	$25,000		$12,255		$2,183	$120	$9,810	$7,912			$201,579
1939	141,366	25,000		12,954		2,130	209	9,604	6,711			197,974
1940	161,142	30,000		12,591		1,965	98	9,400	9,990			225,186
1941	186,282	30,000		15,725		2,700	73	12,795	7,091			254,666
1942	178,268	30,000		13,639	$3,451	7,159	90	11,895	2,580			247,082
1943	195,477	30,000		15,465	2,808	6,843	23	8,740	586			259,942
1944	225,789	[1] 30,000		15,681	2,855	5,864	10	7,538	1,503			289,240
1945	235,643	[1] 29,852		17,869	2,875	7,756	40	9,979	682			304,696
1946	250,996	[1] 14,636		17,405	2,875	9,027	24	11,837	2,951			309,751
1947	772,122	[1] 33,094		17,452	3,199	6,239	71	14,788	1,542			848,507
1948	1,067,200	32,039	$13,293	29,382	5,867	23,682	7,522	14,425	1,092			1,194,502
1949	1,023,060	33,896		28,802	5,801	9,409	954	15,993	5,928			1,123,843
1950	1,185,660	40,000	6,787	32,815	7,725	10,181	1,500	17,345	2,722			1,304,735
1951	1,367,294	37,131	4,929	34,092	7,655	17,406	900	20,651	5,641			1,495,699
1952	1,446,264	39,989	10,151	44,279	7,425	18,004	911	23,580	18,795			1,609,398
1953	1,525,290	55,266	9,561	34,382	10,190	32,345	2,401	30,242	32,647			1,732,324
1954	1,435,479	41,564	18,636	48,416	4,626	30,098	811	31,098	29,724			1,640,452
1955	1,640,038	40,000	20,000	55,152	3,675	34,287	1,382	37,323	22,913			1,854,770
1956	1,649,934	39,240	12,556	62,520	3,327	37,832	6,020	35,608	30,315			1,877,952
1957	1,672,258	29,062	8,763	51,061	2,533	35,448	6,741	31,899	9,181			1,846,946
1958	1,748,437	32,140	8,205	58,879	2,830	46,388	6,805	48,056	12,599	$80,055	$7,576	2,051,970
1959 (estimated)	1,878,165	40,000	25,000	50,000	4,000	30,000	7,000	30,000	15,000	66,835	6,000	2,152,000
1960 (estimated)	1,947,165	40,000	25,000	50,000	4,000	30,000	7,000	30,000	10,000	71,835	6,000	2,221,000

[1] The Federal budget for these years does not indicate whether these funds were for the exclusive use of the President or were for the White House staff.

Source: The Budget of the U.S. Government. Annual volumes for the years 1940 through 1960. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

"TABLE 7.—*Special projects* [1]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1956	$1,250,000	$1,250,000	95
1957	1,500,000	1,500,000	113
1958	1,500,000	1,381,000	114
1959	1,500,000	1,500,000	[2] 101
1960	1,500,000		[2] 101

[1] For staff assistance for the President on special problems, e.g., coordination of public works planning, foreign economy policy, etc.
[2] Estimated.

"TABLE 8.—*U.S. Secret Service, White House Police*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1938	$150,650	$150,650	60
1939	150,650	150,650	60
1940	150,650	150,650	60
1941	151,400	203,900	80
1942	202,400	263,170	100
1943	202,400	354,400	94
1944	354,400	354,400	92
1945	322,000	309,000	98
1946	269,000	318,500	102
1947	334,000	379,500	110
1948	381,900	381,900	107
1949	370,000	399,000	107
1950	370,000	404,500	110
1951	418,000	522,000	172
1953	698,000	698,000	170
1954	698,000	730,000	145
1955	712,000	786,008	163
1956	800,000	857,000	163
1957	859,000	859,000	160
1958	865,000	908,000	160
1959	[1] 980,000	865,000	[2] 160

[1] Includes a supplemental request of $115,000 for fiscal year 1959 contained in the 1960 Federal budget.
[2] Estimated.

NOTE.—The appropriations given are for salaries and expenses (including uniforms and equipment) for the police used for protection of the White House and grounds. Excluded from this tabulation are the personnel and the funds employed for the personal protection of the President and his immediate family. The U.S. Secret Service advises that this information cannot be segregated from other functions performed by their service.

"TABLE 9.—*Bureau of the Budget*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1938	$222,000	$222,000	45
1939	225,000	480,710	103
1940	519,280	671,455	158
1941	808,000	840,100	281
1942	1,237,000	1,315,000	357

Footnotes at end of table.

"TABLE 9.—*Bureau of the Budget*—Continued

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1943	$1,982,000	$1,982,000	507
1944	2,712,000	2,817,500	547
1945	3,827,000	2,956,800	566
1946	2,967,100	3,037,357	583
1947	4,052,500	3,762,483	599
1948	3,470,000	3,376,608	595
1949	3,467,000	3,280,500	534
1950	3,314,500	3,300,000	531
1951	3,486,000	3,412,000	534
1952	3,447,000	3,608,000	515
1953	3,850,000	3,461,200	485
1954	3,700,000	3,412,000	446
1955	3,390,000	3,388,617	435
1956	3,349,000	3,559,000	425
1957	3,559,000	3,935,000	458
1958	4,400,000	4,340,000	455
1959	[1] 4,589,000	4,205,000	[2] 435
1960	4,665,000		[2] 435

[1] Includes supplemental request of $384,000 for 1959 presented in the 1960 Federal budget.
[2] Estimated.

"TABLE 10.—*Council of Economic Advisers*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1947		$275,000	30
1948	$433,000	350,000	44
1949	400,000	310,000	39
1950	340,000	300,000	36
1951	330,000	300,000	39
1952	392,800	341,800	47
1953	349,000	225,000	33
1954	300,000	301,986	26
1955	325,000	351,000	33
1956	385,000	329,000	32
1957	365,700	365,700	31
1958	398,000	375,000	31
1959	[1] 395,000	375,000	[2] 31
1960	395,000		[2] 21

[1] Includes supplemental request of $20,000 for 1959 presented in the 1960 Federal budget.
[2] Estimated.

NOTE.—Established by the Employment Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 24).

"TABLE 11.—*National Security Council*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1949	$200,000	$200,000	31
1950	217,000	200,000	25
1951	175,000	160,000	20
1952	160,000	160,000	23
1953	186,000	155,000	27
1954	160,000	220,000	29
1955	215,000	215,000	28
1956	240,000	244,000	28

Footnotes at end of table.

"TABLE 11.—*National Security Council*—Con.

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1957	$248,000	$248,000	28
1958	710,000	711,000	77
1959	[1] 769,000	700,000	[2] 77
1960	792,000		[2] 77

[1] Includes supplemental request of $69,000 for fiscal year 1959 contained in the 1960 Federal budget.
[2] Estimated.

NOTE.—Established by the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 496).

"TABLE 12.—*National Security Resources Board*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1949	$4,500,000	$3,000,000	280
1950	4,000,000	3,400,000	250
1951	3,500,000	3,500,000	353
1952	4,000,000	1,627,000	135
1953	1,780,000	625,000	135
1954	1,300,000		

NOTE.—Established by the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 499) as an independent agency. Transferred to Executive Office of the President by Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1949. Board and offices of Chairman and Vice Chairman abolished and remaining functions transferred to newly established Office of Defense Mobilization by Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1953.

"TABLE 13

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
Office of Defense Mobilization:			
1951			
1952		$1,711,250	199
1953		2,409,564	536
1954		2,870,216	389
1955	$2,761,000	2,161,000	294
1956	2,220,000	2,225,000	250
1957	2,283,000	2,200,000	251
1958	2,380,000	2,214,000	[2] 238
1959	2,420,000	[1] 2,285,000	[2] 254
Federal Civil Defense Administration:			
1951	80,000,000	26,750,000	555
1952	430,000,000	75,310,000	1,175
1953	575,000,000	43,000,000	789
1954	150,000,000	46,525,000	773
1955	85,750,000	49,325,000	721
1956	59,300,000	68,675,000	992
1957	123,200,000	93,560,000	1,141
1958	180,000,000	39,300,000	[2] 1,389
1959	67,800,000	38,500,000	[2] 1,575

Footnotes at end of table.

"TABLE 13.—Continued

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:			
1960	$36,970,000		[2] 1,768

[1] In addition, $4,500,000 was appropriated for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the fiscal year 1959.
[2] Estimated.

NOTE.—The Office of Defense Mobilization was established in the Executive Office of the President by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953 (67 Stat. 634). The Federal Civil Defense Administration was first created within the Office for Emergency Management by Executive Order 10186 of Dec. 1, 1950. It was subsequently established as an independent agency by the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1245). By Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was created by merger of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

"TABLE 14.—*President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization*

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriations approved	Number of positions
1954		$60,000	5
1955			6
1956	$60,000	60,000	6
1957	60,000	57,500	5
1958	57,500	50,000	5
1959	57,500	58,000	[1] 5
1960	58,000		[1] 5

[1] Estimated.

NOTE.—Established by Executive Order 10432 of Jan. 24, 1953.

"TABLE 15.—*President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions*

Fiscal year 1956:
Budget request $300,000
Appropriations approved $312,000
Number of positions 24

NOTE.—Created by Executive Order 10588 to make a special study of the veterans' compensation and pension program. Its activities ceased after submission of its report on Apr. 23, 1956.

"TABLE 16.—*Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel*

Fiscal year 1954:
Budget request $225,000
Appropriations approved $225,000
Number of positions 18

NOTE.—Created by the act of July 16, 1952 (66 Stat. 723) and authorized to make a report to Congress by Dec. 31, 1953.

"SOURCES

"The Budget of the U.S. Government. Annual volumes for the fiscal years 1938 through 1940. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

"'A Jet Plane—Something New for the White House Fleet,' U.S. News & World Report, March 19, 1959, pp. 62–3.

"'*Columbine III* Cost $348 Hourly in Air,' Washington Post, July 24, 1957, p. 2.

"'Eisenhower and His Money. Many Extra Benefits Available to President,' Washington Star, July 29, 1957, pp. A–1, A–5.

"'When Ike Travels—Golf Carts to Yachts, a Big Fleet Stands by,' U.S. News & World Report, March 19, 1959, pp. 62–3.

"U.S. Congress. House Committee on Appropriations. Hearings. Independent Offices Appropriations for 1952. 82d Congress, 1st session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951, p. 6.

"———. Hearings. General Government Matters Appropriations for 1959. 85th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 135."

In addition, numerous articles have appeared on this subject, two of which are given below:

"[From the U.S. News & World Report]

"WHEN IKE TRAVELS—GOLF CARTS TO YACHTS, A BIG FLEET STANDS BY

"(When a President wants to travel, he can choose from a vast array of vehicles. President Eisenhower, for example, has available 3 airplanes, 2 yachts, a railroad car, 20 automobiles, a farm car, and a motorized golf cart. Included are two specially built Cadillacs for Secret Service men. Now two helicopters are being added to the White House armanda. They will be used to fly the President and his Secret Service guards on short trips—to the airport, perhaps to his golf club, and his Gettysburg farm. Idea is that tey will save Ike's time and protect him from traffic dangers.)

"Dwight D. Eisenhower has found a new way to simplify the difficult job of being President of the United States. He is soon to get a helicopter to whisk him away from the White House and back again on short trips. Another helicopter is being acquired to carry the Secret Service men who must accompany and guard the President everywhere he goes.

"The White House announcement of the purchase of the helicopters is now centering attention on the transportation facilities that a President enjoys in these days of mechanization and air travel.

"Already, Mr. Eisenhower is far ahead of any previous President when it comes to conveniences and conveyances. He has at his disposal a vast array of vehicles—ranging from a $3 million airplane to a motorized golf cart.

"Now, with the addition of two helicopters to his transportation armada, the President will have a vehicle for almost every occasion.

"Dangerous traffic jams

"Main idea behind the purchase of the helicopters is to save the President's time and protect him from traffic jams, which are dangerous as well as a source of delay.

"The whirlybirds will be used principally, according to White House officials, to fly Mr. Eisenhower from the White House to the airport. They also may be used, officials say, to fly him to the Burning Tree golf club—8.8 air miles northwest of the White House—or to speed him to his farm at Gettysburg, Pa.—about 60 miles away by air.

"Another idea, not being publicized but admitted by a White House aide to have been taken into consideration, is this: 'The helicopters would be of great value if the President ever had to evacuate Washington in a hurry in case of attack.'

"Mr. Eisenhower is a man who likes to get from point A to point B in the shortest possible time. To accomplish this, he will now have at his disposal—including the helicopters—5 aircraft, 2 yachts, a fleet of about 20 automobiles, a special railroad car, a motorized golf cart, and a miniature automobile for touring his farm. Other vehicles of various kinds are readily available in case of special need.

"Previous Presidents also have had planes, yachts, railroad cars and automobiles. Helicopters, however, are something entirely new to presidential travel.

"Range: 200 miles

"The helicopters, which will go into service in about 2 months, are Bell 47–J Rangers, costing about $60,000 apiece. Each can carry four people, and has a range of about 200 miles. The 47–J can fly at about 100 miles an hour.

"One of the helicopters will carry the President, his pilot, and a Secret Service man. The other will carry three more Secret Service men.

"Chief asset of the helicopters is that they can take off from the White House lawn and land only a few feet away from the precise destination—beside the President's big plane at the airport, near the first tee at Burning Tree, or on the lawn at Gettysburg.

"Result is considerable time saved. Exactly how much may be saved can be seen in the chart on page 50.

"Adding up all the trips that Mr. Eisenhower usually makes to the airport, to Burning Tree and to Gettysburg in a year, you come up with a yearly saving in travel time of at least 40 hours, if helicopters are used.

"Helicopters, however, will be only a small part of President Eisenhower's motorized armada.

"Queen of the travel fleet still will be the *Columbine III*, the four-engine Super Constellation that Ike uses on long trips. This $3 million plane drinks up $97 worth of gasoline every hour it is in the air, and the Government spends at least $20,000 a month to guard it and keep it in flying trim.

"The *Columbine* requires a crew of 10 persons, including 4 stewards, and the President's personal pilot, Lt. Col. William G. Draper. The big, silver-gray ship has every possible convenience—including a galley, a stateroom, a dressing room, and sleeping quarters for at least 10 passengers.

"For flights of medium distance, the White House has two $75,000 Aero-Commanders, each of which carries six persons. These are the planes which have been used for flights to Gettysburg. When Mr. Eisenhower was recuperating at the farm after his ileitis operation, last year, at least four Aero-Commanders were used in a shuttle service for White House aids and presidential callers.

"Land fleet

"On the roads, President Eisenhower can command an impressive fleet of automobiles. About 20 cars are rented for the White House staff. Reserved for the President's personal use are a late model Cadillac, and the famous 'bubble' car—a Lincoln incorporating features suggested by Ike.

"The 'bubble' is a sloping roof of Plexiglas which covers the entire rear seat. This protects Ike from the weather, but enables crowds to see him as he drives by. It can be brightly lighted so he can be seen by night. Mr. Eisenhower got the idea of the 'bubble' in 1954 when he noticed that people lining the sidewalks as he drove by were unable to see him when the top of his convertible was put up.

"Cost of the 'bubble' car is estimated at more than $30,000.

"Recent additions to the White House fleet of cars are two Cadillacs which have bodies of heavy steel and cost $65,000 each. They were especially designed for the Secret Service men who always accompany the President's limousine. The vehicles are open cars, with special frames, engines and chassis, and with bodies reinforced with heavy metal. They have running boards and footstands for the Secret Service men, and special compartments for tommyguns and pistols. Each car can carry nine persons at speeds up to 100 miles per hour.

"Just last week, friends gave Mr. Eisenhower the 1942 Cadillac that was his command car in World War II. The car will go into the Eisenhower memorial museum at Abilene, Kans.

"On his farm, Mr. Eisenhower has several vehicles. Best known is a miniature automobile with a fringed canvas top—also a gift.

"Motorized golf

"Ike also uses motorized transport on the golf course. At Augusta, Ga., he rides from tee to green in a chromium-trimmed cart that has his initial printed in gold on the side. It was donated to the President by friends at the Augusta National Golf Course, where he goes several times each year to play his favorite game.

"Cost of the golf cart is estimated at about $1,000. It is chauffeured about the golf course by a Secret Service man.

"Sometimes Ike's cart is joined on the golf course by other carts carrying fellow players. Secret Service men and the President's personal physician, Maj. Gen. Howard McC. Snyder.

"The sight of this motorized caravan advancing across a golf course has been described by watchers as something resembling a tank attack. As a matter of fact, considerable firepower is contained in those carts. Secret Service men carry submachineguns in their golf bags. At least one of the carts is equipped with two-way radio.

"Rail travel

"President Eisenhower has a special railroad car—called the Ferdinand Magellan—which is truly a home on wheels. The Government bought it for only $1 in 1946, but its value is estimated at $200,000. Mr. Eisenhower, however, doesn't care much for the old car and uses it very little.

"When the President does travel by train, as on a campaign speaking trip, he usually uses a more modern car belonging to some railroad official.

"Small Navy

"President Eisenhower doesn't care much for ships or yachting. He dispose of the yacht *Wililamsburg* which the Navy kept in trim for former President Harry S. Truman. However, Ike still is able to call on two vessels set aside by the Navy for presidential use.

"One is a 92-foot yacht named *Barbara Anne* which cost $140,000 to recondition. The other is a 60-foot yacht called *Susie E.* which $35,000 to put in shape. It would take at least $500,000 to duplicate the two craft today, and the Navy spends an estimated $60,000 a year to keep them maintained and manned. The vessels are named for the President's granddaughters.

"Despite these naval facilities, Ike has made only four boat trips since he took office.

"Arrival of the two new helicopters is expected to be the last major change in presidential transportation for some years to come. After studies, it has been decided that jets are not at present feasible for use by the White House.

"'But someday the President will have a rocket ship, I guess,' says a White House aid."

"[From the U.S. News & World Report]

"A JETPLANE: SOMETHING NEW FOR THE WHITE HOUSE FLEET

"(Mr. Eisenhower plans to be the first President to travel by jet, with a special jet transport on order for his use. The jet to be added to the fleet of White House planes will fly at 575 miles per hour, reach Paris in 7 hours, cost $4.7 million. With eight planes, Ike expects to set a record for travel.)

"President Eisenhower in April is scheduled to add a jet airliner to his fleet of travel facilities.

"Mr. Eisenhower already is the first President to travel extensively by helicopter. He has a four-engine Super-Constellation, especially fitted and reserved for his own use. Half a dozen smaller aircraft—six-passenger Aero-Commanders and new-model helicopters—are kept available for White House transportation at any time.

"The new jet is to be a modified Boeing 707, similar to those being used by commercial airlines on transatlantic runs but with an especially designed interior for the President's convenience on long trips.

"Time saver

"With his jet transport, Mr. Eisenhower will be able to carry out his announced plans for traveling over much of the world in the coming two years, while losing little time in actual travel. The jet, flying at 575 miles an hour, will bring Paris to within 7 hours of the White House. India can be reached in only 14 hours, the Philippines in about the same time. A trip to Alaska for statehood ceremonies in July will take no more than 9 hours. Hawaii can be reached in about 8 hours from Washington.

"The Presidential jet, as yet unnamed, is to be checked out thoroughly after its delivery in April, and ready to use by mid-June at the latest. It will be one of three 707 transports, all fitted with special interiors and extra equipment, to be maintained by the Air Force in Washington for 'special air mission' flights. Of the two others, one is to be for State Department use, one for standby and occasional use by top-level officials.

"You get an idea of what the President's newest plane will be like from the drawing on these pages. There will be plush furnishings to accommodate Mr. Eisenhower, a party of aids and officials, plus a number of Secret Service men—up to 46 passengers, in addition to the crew.

"Comfort and efficiency

"While traveling at 30,000 feet and close to the speed of sound, most of the President's party will be able to relax in reclinable seats in the front and rear cabins. The center cabin will become the main living area, with sofa beds for Mr. Eisenhower's use, tables with swivel chairs, closets, and a dressing area for overnight flights. A pulldown container for charts is installed in this area, along with a projection screen, for use in briefings conducted during flight.

"It's a big plane, 145 feet long and about 139 feet from wingtip to wingtip. The commercial version, with a standard seating arrangement, can carry more than 100 passengers across the Atlantic in relative comfort. The President's model, with far fewer passengers, will carry a great deal of special equipment for navigation, communication, and safety. It will be based at Andrews Air Force Base, in Maryland close to Washington.

"Cost: $4.7 million

"What about its cost? That is estimated now at $4.7 million, or about 50 percent more than the especially equipped Super Constellation which now serves as the queen of the Presidential fleet of aircraft. Each of the two other 'SAM' jets ordered by the Air Force will cost the same.

"The President still expects to keep and use his fleet of other vehicles, however, for future trips in the air.

"The now-famous *Columbine*—Ike's Super Constellation which has been used for trips abroad—will be retained for future trips of moderate length. This piston-driven aircraft cost about $3 million, carries a crew of 10, and is equipped with an elaborate galley, a stateroom, a dressing room, and sleeping quarters for at least 10 passengers.

"In addition, two $75,000 Aero-Commanders, each able to carry six persons, are to be kept available for White House use on 1-day notice. These small planes also are maintained by the Air Force, can be used for trips of a few hundred miles. In the past, they have been used to provide a shuttle service between Washington and Gettysburg for the President and members of his staff.

"The President's personal pilot, Col. William G. Draper, will fly the fast new jet as well as these propeller-type aircraft when Mr. Eisenhower is aboard. Presidential air travel now is taking more and more of his time.

"New, larger helicopters

"Helicopters, too, are being used frequently now by President Eisenhower, who flies in one nearly every week. For short hops, he is using a bigger model than he flew in earlier. This new version is the 12-passenger S–58 type, furnished in pairs by the Marine Corps and the Army alternately as they are needed by the White House.

"With his expanded fleet of jet and piston-type aircraft, Mr. Eisenhower now plans a series of globe-hopping trips for this year and next, and expects to log more trip mileage in these 2 years ahead than he has in the last 6. To date, the President has made nine trips outside the continental United States, with two trips each to Europe, Bermuda, Canada, and Mexico, one to Panama.

"A flying trip to India, Pakistan, and the Philippines, for example, is scheduled. The President especially wants to visit India's Jawaharlal Nehru and may include a visit to Japan in the course of this trip.

"Two European trips

"At least two trips to Europe are in the planning stage. A new summit meeting is still possible, to be held probably at Geneva. Separate meetings with allied heads of state in Europe are under consideration as well, with Mr. Eisenhower now able to get there for weekend get-togethers by jet.

"A visit to Canada is planned for the end of June, when the President will meet with Britain's Queen Elizabeth and attend ceremonies opening the new St. Lawrence Seaway.

"In addition, he plans to attend a 21-nation conference in Latin America, tentatively scheduled for Buenos Aires, and may make special trips to see individual leaders on the pattern of last month's 2-day visit to Acapulco.

"Mr. Eisenhower, in brief, plans not only to be the first President to travel by jet plane, but to make use of the technique of jet travel to cover much of the world for face-to-face meetings in the years just ahead."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Now that the Senate is ready for a vote, I wish to express my appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee, who work so hard on the independent offices appropriation bill and this bill. Many agencies and many problems were involved. Before the Senate voted, I wanted to thank the fine staff, particularly Mr. Earl Cooper, which worked so hard in the subcommittee on these two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Gruening	Morse
Anderson	Hart	Morton
Bartlett	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bible	Hennings	Muskie
Bush	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Pastore
Cannon	Holland	Prouty
Carlson	Hruska	Randolph
Carroll	Humphrey	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Javits	Saltonstall
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Cooper	Jordan	Smathers
Cotton	Keating	Smith
Curtis	Kefauver	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kerr	Stennis
Dodd	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dworshak	Lausche	Thurmond
Eastland	Long	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Engle	McNamara	Yarborough
Ervin	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Frear	Mansfield	
Goldwater	Martin	

NAYS—2

Douglas Proxmire

NOT VOTING—17

Beall	Fulbright	Murray
Bridges	Green	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kennedy	Symington
Byrd, Va.	Langer	Wiley
Capehart	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Case, N.J.	McGee	

So the bill (H.R. 7176) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate that we will convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning, under the order previously entered. We hope that we may be able to pass the tax extension bill tomorrow; and, if necessary, we will run until late in the evening, at least midnight or later.

The President talked to some of us this evening, and he feels it is very essential to get the bill to the White House at the earliest possible date, so I appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle to prepare whatever arguments they may desire to make or whatever amendments they may have to offer, in the hope that the majority of the Senate may decide what it wants to do, and send the bill to conference. We know the bill will have to go to conference. We are hopeful that at least during the remainder of the week we can dispose of such dissension as we may have, and send the bill to the White House not later than Monday, in order that the President may have a chance to review it and determine what his position will be.

I want all Members to know that we expect some yea and nay votes tomorrow, or the next day, or the next day, or at least until the bill shall have passed both Houses of Congress.

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 25, this body passed by the overwhelming vote of 90 to 1, S. 1555, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, the Kennedy-Ervin labor-reform bill as amended on the floor of the Senate.

In the period since the Senate took this action, there has been much discussion—in and out of the Congress—about the ultimate fate of S. 1555. Hearings have been concluded before the House Education and Labor Committee. The AFL-CIO has indicated its strong objections to a number of features in the bill. The major business groups have indicated their objections to the bill—objections which are of course quite different from those expressed by labor. The editorial writers of the Nation have been pouring out thousands of words of praise and of criticism of the bill. Labor corruption continues to be a popular issue.

I rise today, Mr. President, not to discuss the merits—or demertits—of S. 1555 or any other legislative proposals. I have confidence that when the legislative process is completed, the 86th Congress will have hammered out a constructive piece of labor legislation.

In this connection I want to pay warm tribute to my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for the splendid job he has been doing as chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for his role in bringing out of committee a sound, constructive, nonpunitive bill, and for his brilliant floor management of that bill. As so often happens in a democratic body like the Senate, that bill went through numerous changes in the course of Senate action. And again, as often happens, some of those changes may deserve a second look after greater study and after their full implications become fully understood.

As we evaluate this legislation, however, and every other item of labor legislation before us, I urge that a simple criterion guide us. Will the proposed legislation help advance a strong, free, independent labor movement?

Legislation, of course, can do only a small part of the total job that is needed to eliminate corruption not only from the trade union movement but from society at large. The AFL-CIO, let it never be forgotten, did not wait for legislation before it acted. Its ethical practices committee was set up before there was established a Senate Select Committee to investigate improper activities in the field of labor-management relations.

Chaired by one of America's outstanding labor statesmen, the president of the International Association of Machinists, Mr. A. J. Hayes, the ethical practices committee developed ethical practices codes which have already done much to meet the challenge of labor corruption. It was violation of these codes that served as the basis for the courageous action of the AFL-CIO in expelling more than one-tenth of its membership. Would that the business organizations of this country or the legal societies followed this example and insisted upon such strict adherence to ethical behavior. I have yet to hear of one lawyer, of the hundreds already cited in the Senate hearings, being expelled from the American Bar Association. I have yet to hear of the chamber of commerce or the NAM expelling a member because of illegal or unethical business conduct.

For 2 years now we have been hearing much about what is wrong with the American labor movement. A sordid, frightening, distorted image of that labor movement has emerged from the hundreds of hearings, the thousands of editorials and cartoons, the countless speeches about corrupt labor officials.

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss what is right with the American labor movement. If there is any area of human behavior where the dog-bites-man formula is true, it is the area of labor relations. How often do we read articles about labor peace? How often are edi-

torials written about honest labor leaders? Is it not true that a $10,000 union contribution to a worthy charity is less newsworthy than a $100 bribe to a cheap crook? How often does a national magazine do a feature story on building tradesmen contributing their weekends to the rebuilding of a school or a hospital destroyed by fire?

But there seems never to be a shortage of front page space or editorial space when a strike is called, or when some violence flares, or when a union official is called before an investigating committee. Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I think that strikes and violence and labor corruption are worthy of public attention. I think the public should be informed about the issues in a strike, why violence results, which union officials have violated their trust. But the public should also have the full story of what decent, honorable, devoted trade unionists are doing day by day for their fellowmen, for country, and the cause of freedom in a troubled world.

Many of our finest economists, political scientists, sociologists, and philosophers have written at length about the basic meaning and goals of trade unionism. I think that the Hebrew elder, Hillel, many centuries ago, said it all in one brief comment:

If I am not for myself—

He asked—

who will be for me? But if I am only for myself, what am I?

This is the real story of American labor. Working men and women have banded together to further their mutual interests. If they failed to do it for themselves, who would do it for them? But they could not be concerned with their problems alone. If they were only for themselves, what were they?

It is a tragic fact, indeed, that the recent disclosures before the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations, in the absence of adequate publishing of the total labor story in America, have led many people to believe that the labor movement is a narrow, selfish, irresponsible force.

Mr. President, when I hear or see the phrase "labor movement," there does not flash through my mind the image of racketeers. That would be as appropriate and as fair as equating America with slums and juvenile delinquency and lynchings. America has those problems, and more, but America also stands for freedom, for achievement, for individual dignity, for opportunity, for decency, for honor, for compassion, and justice.

No, Mr. President, I think of other things when I think of the labor movement. I think of men whose names are recorded in history for their contribution to the growth of the American labor movement; dedicated and selfless men, such as Samuel Gompers, William Green, Philip Murray, Daniel Tobin, Van Bittner, and Alexander Whitney, to name but a few.

Let me recall just a few recent experiences—direct, personal experiences—that make me feel good to be considered a friend of organized labor.

A few weeks ago I attended an unusual dinner here in Washington. Hundreds of people, including dozens of Members of Congress, came to honor a lobbyist, a labor lobbyist. Usually, of course, it is the other way around. They came to pay tribute to John Edelman, the Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union of America.

For 50 years, 20 of them here in Washington, this humble, soft-spoken gentleman had worked tirelessly for the public interest. There has not been a cause—housing, minimum wages, public power, mutual security, civil rights—into which this union representative has not thrown his great talents, his inspiring leadership. Those talents, that leadership coud have brought John great personal gain. But he has continued to serve the great public interest—as well as his own membership—as a union representative. And to the eternal credit of his union and its great leaders, Emil Rieve and William Pollock, he was encouraged to perform these manifold services.

For every self-serving person in the American labor movement, there are hundreds of John Edelmans. That is what is right with the labor movement.

It was John Edelman himself, by the way, who more than 30 years ago stated so eloquently the great role which unions could play in our modern civilization:

There are before us vast problems in human engineering—

He wrote—

which cannot be solved in any easy formula, but by the oldest method of all—that of reaching men's heart by a deep, moving, human appeal. Television may speed the sending of pictures, the radio may enable men to hear one another talk across continents, but none of these amazing devices will take the place of the ordinary human contact of the labor union and its activities in bringing about a more enlightened attitude among the masses of men in meeting their fundamental human problems.

In the more than 30 years since John Edelman wrote these words, the labor movement has indeed demonstrated its willingness and its ability to bring about that "more enlightened attitude among the masses of men in meeting their most fundamental human problems."

Union organizations have provided for millions of formerly inarticulate citizens the forum in which to hammer out policies affecting the world in which they live and which their children will inherit. And not only have they hammered out policies, but they have developed techniques and resources for implementing those policies. That is what I find so right about the labor movement. They have made democracy and citizenship and the right to petition a reality to millions of men and women.

I speak from some rich personal experience. Like every politician, I enjoy large audiences, television, press conferences, and enthusiastic applause. But perhaps the most stimulating periods I ever spend are the 20- and 30-minute sessions I have with groups of textileworkers, rubberworkers, steelworkers, machinists, building tradesmen, autoworkers, and communication workers who come to Washington to attend their unions' legislative institutes.

We Members of this great deliberative body do not know what debate really is until we have had to answer the searching but down-to-earth questions put to us by workers who know from firsthand the problems of automation, of unemployment, of old age, of radiation hazards, of slums.

The unions have given their wonderful people a voice. That is what is right about the labor movement.

Only last month I found myself sharing a platform with Mr. William Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO. Both of us addressed the merger convention of the American Labor Health Association and the Group Health Federation of America. In the audience were many dozens of union officials and union technicians involved in the vital work of administering health plans and union hospitals and medical centers, working together with some of the Nation's leading medical and insurance authorities. This was nothing new to me—finding union representatives actively involved with other groups in seeking solutions to America's unsolved problems. Mr. Schnitzler made an eloquent plea for bringing full medical care within the reach of all American families. He spoke forthrightly about labor's right and its responsibility to speak out on this issue on behalf of all Americans. In doing so, he explained simply and effectively American labor's role in the whole area of legislation and community activities. Permit me to quote:

I find it rather amusing—but also distressing—that labor is sometimes attacked, on the one hand, for being a selfish, vested interest, and then, on the other hand—by the very same critics—for injecting itself into issues that are not related only to trade unions and their members, and presuming to speak for underprivileged, unorganized workers.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, American labor does presume to speak for more than its own membership. It does this partially as a matter of simple enlightened self-interest. We believe that what is good for America is good for American labor. In one area after another, it is clear that our own members will improve their lot in life only as all the people in the community improve theirs. There is a limit to the things we can obtain for our own members at the collective bargaining table, although we have by no means reached that limit. The welfare, happiness and security of our people requires sound legislation. It also requires the development of appropriate cooperative and other forms of voluntary organizations designed to promote the general welfare. In all of these aspects of American life, the labor movement plays a constructive role.

There used to be in Washington a small organization called the Peoples' Lobby. That phrase is sometimes used to refer to attempts to realize the vague, undefinable desires of the American people as a whole. But the fact of the matter is that there is no really articulate voice of the people. The closest thing to it is the labor movement. We are happy and proud to serve as a people's lobby. We represent at least 50 million men, women, and children in the families of our members. But in much of our work in Congress, in the State legislatures, in the school systems, in the voluntary organizations—we sincerely believe we speak out for the great bulk of all Americans.

For a hundred years now, no one has worked more vigorously than American labor for free, universal education.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 30, 1959
For actions of June 29, 1959
86th-1st, No. 108

CONTENTS

Accounting.....15
Agricultural appropriations.....1
Appropriations 1,2,3,4,5,7,17,28
Area redevelopment.....22
Budget.....28
Claims.....45
Contracts.....8
Country life.....26
Credit unions.....27,32
Dairy industry.....36
Education.....39
Electrification.....21,29
Employment.....15
Fair trade.....34
Farm labor.....17,19
Federal-State relations..21
Food.....9,12
Foreign affairs.....39
Foreign aid.....25,29
Inflation.....11,18
Information.....16,41
Item veto.....44
Legislative program.....29
Library.....41
Marketing.....9
Monopolies.....13
Mutual security.....25,29
Personnel.....10,15,38,39
Prices.....11,18
Public debt.....24
Public Law 480.....29
Reclamation.....20,37
Research.....10,30
Retirement.....10
Saline water.....30
Small business.....42
Soil bank.....45
Soil conservation.....35
Taxation.....38
Tobacco.....31
Transportation.....14
TVA.....29
Virgin Islands.....40
Water resources.....23
Watersheds.....6
Wheat.....33
Wilderness.....43

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on agricultural appropriation bill. House passed supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses cleared general governments matters appropriation bill. Sen. Mansfield criticized surplus food distribution policy.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7175 (H. Rept. 588) (pp. 11009-11, 11075). Rep. Judd objected to the request of Rep. Whitten for immediate consideration of the report (p. 11011). At the end of this Digest is a summary of the actions of the conferees.

2. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Agreed to an amendment to a Senate amendment on this bill, H. R. 7176, which will appropriate $125,000 (instead of $250,000 as provided by the Senate) for the use of Federal agencies, under the direction of the Budget Bureau, in improving management operation and establishing more efficient business methods in Government operations (p. 11006). The Senate later agreed to this House amendment (pp. 10985-6). This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 7978 (pp. 11020-44). See Digest 106, item 20, for items of interest to this Department.

4. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 7343 (p. 11006). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

5. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 5676 (p. 11006). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

6. WATERSHEDS. The Public Works Committee approved the following watershed plans: Tobesofkee Creek, Ga., Big Blue Creek, Ill., and Shoal Creek, Ill. p. 11007

7. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Acted on the Senate amendments to this bill, H. R. 7453, and returned the bill to the Senate. pp. 11007-9

8. CONTRACTS. Conferees were granted permission until midnight June 29, to file a report on H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951. p. 11020

9. FOOD; MARKETING. Received from the Federal Trade Commission an economic report, "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing - Interim Report." p. 11075

10. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a "Special Report of the Board of Actuaries on the Valuation of the Civil Service Retirement System as of June 30, 1958." p. 11075
The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6059, to provide additional civilian positions for the Defense Department for acientific research and development (H. Rept. 597). p. 11076

11. PRICES; INFLATION. Several Representatives debated the merits of the report of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, and discussed the problem of controlling inflation. pp. 11046-51, 11052-55, 11055-62

SENATE

12. FOOD SURPLUSES. Sen. Mansfield criticized the Administration's food distribution policies here and abroad, urged the Administration to give Congress "a program which will see to it that every needy person in this country gets an equitable share" of our food production, recommended a long-range program to close up "disgraceful loopholes" in present law, to aid schools and other institutions, and to aid foreign countries, and inserted several articles on the subject. pp. 10931-3

13. MONOPOLIES. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 716, to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws (S. Rept. 451). p. 10924

14. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 1789, to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply (S. Rept. 452). p. 10924

15. PERSONNEL; ACCOUNTING. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments two bills: S. 1495, to consolidate and revise the laws relating to employment of aliens in the several States and the District of Columbia (S. Rept. 437), and H. R. 6134, to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 so as to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years (S. Rept. 436). p. 10924

Mr. CARROLL. Assuming that the conference report shall be rejected, and the Senate conferees try again to reach agreement with the House conferees, will the Senator from Delaware take a strong position on the McCarthy amendment? If the Republican conferees joined with the Democrats, does not the Senator believe something could be accomplished in conference to carry the manifest intention of this body to the other House?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not. The suggestion has been made that we could avoid this situation by passing H.R. 7567, which is now on the Senate Calendar with a simple extension attached. It is a minor bill which has come to the Senate from the House Committee on Ways and Means. If it is desired to extend the excise taxes, why not pass this conference report, then bring up H.R. 7567, which is already on the Senate Calendar, and adopt these same amendments as a part of that bill. Then we will have plenty of time in which to work out an agreement with the House.

Why reject this conference report, which embraces legislation that will expire at midnight tomorrow to attach an amendment of the Senate which, even if it were adopted, would not become effective until January 1960.

The McCarthy amendment will not become effective until January 1960. If it is proposed to legislate for 1960, why not do it on a bill with respect to which we will have time to negotiate with the House.

The suggestion has been made that the conference should have accepted all the Senate amendments in the name of fiscal responsibility. That is ridiculous. Had the Senate been successful in having the House accept all of its amendments as they passed the Senate, the loss in revenue would have been $188 million for the next fiscal year. It would have been $250 million in the next calendar year.

The Smathers amendment, in the 1960 fiscal year, would have caused a loss of $188 million, for a full year, the loss would be $250 million.

There would have been a loss of $100 million on the Long amendment during the next fiscal year.

That is a total of $298 million loss for the 1960 fiscal year.

But there would have been only $100 million picked up by the McCarthy amendment for the fiscal year 1960. This is because the McCarthy amendment does not become effective until January 1, 1960.

Had we been successful in having all of the Senate amendments accepted by the House there would have been a loss of $188 million.

Certainly the administration has objected to such a loss in revenue. It is interesting and somewhat amusing to hear some of those advocating the rejection of this conference report and to do so on the assumption that they are trying to balance the budget. The House took the firm position that it would not go along with that loss and the Senate conferees agreed.

Therefore, Mr. President, considering all the factors involved, I believe we have arrived at the best possible report we can obtain. The question before us tonight is whether we want these taxes to continue or whether we want them to lapse.

For the Senate to reject this report it would, in my opinion, be the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as absent on official business attending the Nuclear Test Suspension Conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—57

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Allott	Eastland	McClellan
Beall	Ervin	Martin
Bennett	Frear	Morton
Bible	Fulbright	Mundt
Bridges	Goldwater	Pastore
Bush	Green	Prouty
Butler	Hartke	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Russell
Capehart	Hill	Saltonstall
Carlson	Holland	Schoeppel
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Smith
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Cotton	Keating	Talmadge
Curtis	Kefauver	Thurmond
Dirksen	Kerr	Wiley
Dodd	Kuchel	Williams, Del.

NAYS—35

Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bartlett	Humphrey	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Muskie
Cannon	Kennedy	Neuberger
Carroll	Lausche	Proxmire
Church	Long	Randolph
Clark	McCarthy	Smathers
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Ellender	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Magnuson	Yarborough
Gruening	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—6

Gore	Jordan	O'Mahoney
Hickenlooper	Murray	Young, N. Dak.

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Virginia to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, to the bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 44, and 46 through 51, to the bill (H.R. 7453) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has a noncontroversial item on an appropriation bill which I should like to have agreed to, so that the bill can go to the White House tonight, if the Senate will permit.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington for the purpose of having the Senate consider a message from the House of Representatives regarding the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1960.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 7176, the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7176, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
June 29, 1959.

Resolved, That the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 7176) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government

agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $250,000 named in said amendment, insert "$125,000."

That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing a comparison between the estimates and the action taken on the items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of estimates with action taken on general Government matters appropriation bill, 1960

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Estimates, 1960	House bill	Senate bill	Floor action in lieu of conference
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Compensation of the President	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,00
The White House Office	2,222,000	2,221,000	2,221,000	2,221,000	2,221,000
Special projects	1,329,970	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Executive Mansion and Grounds	449,400	475,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
Bureau of the Budget	4,550,600	4,665,000	4,665,000	4,665,000	4,665,000
Council of Economic Advisers	393,000	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000
National Security Council	759,400	792,000	792,000	792,000	792,000
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	57,500	57,500	57,500	57,500	57,500
Total, Executive Office of the President	9,911,870	10,255,500	10,255,500	10,255,500	10,255,500
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Emergency fund for the President, national defense	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Expenses of management improvement		250,000		250,000	125,000
Total, funds appropriated to the President	1,000,000	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,250,000	1,125,000
AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	1,268,000	1,295,000	1,295,000	1,295,000	1,295,000
Construction of memorials and cemeteries	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Total, American Battle Monuments Commission	1,268,000	1,295,000	1,295,000	1,295,000	1,295,000
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	[3] 610,500	[4] 408,000	[4] 408,000	[4] 408,000	[4] 408,000
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	375,000	400,000	380,000	360,000	380,000
Grand total	13,165,370	13,608,500	13,338,500	13,568,500	13,463,500

[1] Including amounts in H.R. 5916 (2d supplemental, 1959).
[2] Language only.
[3] Plus $91,800 from war claims fund.
[4] Plus $50,000 from war claims fund.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, TO FACILITATE FINANCING OF CERTAIN AIRCRAFT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1368, relating to sections 503 and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1368) to amend sections 503 and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to facilitate financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph (2) of section 503(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any lease, and any mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, or other instrument executed for security purposes, which lease or other instrument affects the title to, or any interest in, any specifically identified aircraft engine or engines of seven hundred and fifty or more rated takeoff horsepower for each such engine or the equivalent of such horsepower, or any specifically identified aircraft propeller capable of absorbing seven hundred and fifty or more rated takeoff shaft horsepower, and also any assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto;".

SEC. 2. Section 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"LIMITATION OF SECURITY OWNERS LIABILITY

"SEC. 504. No person having a security interest in, or security title to, any civil aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller under a contract of conditional sale, equipment trust, chattel or corporate mortgage, or other instrument of similar nature, and no lessor of any such aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller under a bona fide lease of thirty days or more, shall be liable by reason of such interest or title, or by reason of his interest as lessor or owner of the aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller so leased, for any injury to or death of persons, or damage to or loss of property, on the surface of the earth (whether on land or water) caused by such aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller, or by the ascent, descent, or flight of such aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller or by the dropping or falling of an object therefrom, unless such aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller is in the actual possession or control of such person at the time of such injury, death, damage, or loss."

SEC. 3. The proviso contained in section 503(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That an instrument recorded under section 503(a)(2) shall not be affected as to the engine or engines, or propeller or propellers, specifically identified therein, by any instrument theretofore or thereafter recorded pursuant to section 503(a)(3)."

SEC. 4. Paragraph (1) of section 503(f) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the identifying description of the aircraft, aircraft engine, or propeller, or in the case of an instrument referred to in section 503(a)(3), the location or locations specified therein; and" and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend sections 503 and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to facilitate financing of certain aircraft engines and propellers."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the changes in the bill are only of a technical and clarifying nature. I have cleared the matter with all Senators who are interested. There are no substantive changes.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I not have the floor? When did I lose my right to the floor? I yielded to the Senator from Washington, and I should like to yield now to the Senator from Mississippi for a brief announcement. Then I will yield the floor so that the Senator from Connecticut may obtain it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me. I should like to be recognized after the announcement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I will ask the Senator from Texas a question, for the information of the Senate. Does the Senator from Mississippi correctly understand that the military construction bill will not be considered tonight, but will be considered immediately after morning business tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Texas expects the Senate to convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Lane Dwinell, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Walter K. Scott, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

BUREAU OF THE MINT

William H. Brett, of Ohio, to be Director of the Mint for a term of 5 years. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Sigurd Anderson, of South Dakota, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1959. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Harold A. Kertz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1962. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., O223635, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army Reserve) in the rank of lieutenant general.

House of Representatives

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert L. McCachran, First Presbyterian Church, Van Wert, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O God, who hast made of one blood all the nations of the world, and who by Thy word and spirit dost marvelously work out the reconciliation of mankind, so that all may be brothers, cleanse Thou our hearts and forgive the selfishness that ignores the ties which Thou hast established.

Give to these Thy servants, who represent the people from every city, village, and farm in every corner of these United States, the will to work together as a team for the welfare of all our people, regardless of race, or class, or creed.

Give them enlightened vision to see the sacrifices that must be made continually by all of us if we are to do that which is righteous in Thy sight.

May these men and women so live and work in these sacred Halls of Congress that the sacrifices that have already been made for our liberty and freedom shall not have been made in vain.

In all issues, small or large, that come before these Representatives here today, wilt Thou reveal to them Thy wisdom and Thy guiding love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 26, 1959, was read and approved.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5676) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1960, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RABAUT, NATCHER, CANNON, RHODES of Arizona, and TABER.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7343) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY, PRESTON, CANNON, BOW, and TABER.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND SUNDRY GENERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 11, insert:

"EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

"For expenses necessary to assist the President in improving the management of executive agencies and in obtaining greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of more efficient business methods in Government operations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, by allocation to any agency or office in the executive branch for the conduct, under the general direction of the Bureau of the Budget, of examinations and appraisals of, and the development and installation of improvements in, the organization and operations of such agency or of other agencies in the executive branch, $250,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available without regard to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $250,000 named in said amendment, insert "$125,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 23, strike out "$380,000" and insert "$360,000."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves that the House disagree to Senate amendment No. 2.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

VAULT CASH BILL

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARR], and myself, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House that we will have on the floor tomorrow the vault cash bill, from the Committee on Banking and Currency. There will be some discussion of it and its relationship to the question of the interest rate problem in the special orders that will follow this afternoon.

MEMORIAL FOR JAMES MADISON

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a significant article and editorial which appeared in the Sunday, June 28, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The article points out that James Madison, the fourth President of the United States and the man known in history as the Father of our Constitution and author of the Bill of Rights, is the only American of the highest rank in history who is not honored with a memorial.

Public Law 86-79
86th Congress, H. R. 7176
July 8, 1959

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1960.

73 Stat. 161.
73 Stat. 162.

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Compensation of the President

For compensation of the President, including an expense allowance at the rate of $50,000 per annum as authorized by the Act of January 19, 1949 (3 U.S.C. 102), $150,000.

63 Stat. 4.

The White House Office

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for The White House Office, including not to exceed $215,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as the President may specify, and other personal services without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment and compensation of persons in the Government service; newspapers, periodicals, teletype news service, and travel, and official entertainment expenses of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $2,221,000.

60 Stat. 810.

Special Projects

For expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the President in connection with special projects, to be expended in his discretion and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per centum of this appropriation may be used to reimburse the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, The White House Office", for administrative services.

Executive Mansion and Grounds

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, $475,000.

Bureau of the Budget

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget, including not to exceed $110,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed $20,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $4,665,000.

60 Stat. 810.

Council of Economic Advisers

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021), including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $400); not exceeding $15,000 for expenses of travels and press clippings (not exceeding $300); $395,000.

60 Stat. 23.

73 Stat. 162.

73 Stat. 163.

National Security Council

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; and acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; $792,000.

60 Stat. 810.

President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, established by Executive Order 10432 of January 24, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, $57,500.

3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp., p. 928.

60 Stat. 810.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense

For expenses necessary to enable the President, through such officers or agencies of the Government as he may designate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Eighty-sixth Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

Expenses of Management Improvement

For expenses necessary to assist the President in improving the management of executive agencies and in obtaining greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of more efficient business

methods in Government operations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, by allocation to any agency or office in the executive branch for the conduct, under the general direction of the Bureau of the Budget, of examinations and appraisals of, and the development and installation of improvements in, the organization and operations of such agency or of other agencies in the executive branch, $125,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available without regard to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

60 Stat. 810.

31 USC 665.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions; not to exceed $70,000 for expenses of travel; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; $1,295,000: *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of personnel assigned to it.

73 Stat. 163.

73 Stat. 164.

CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

Not to exceed $160,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for necessary expenses of appropriate dedications of World War I and II memorials, erected under the authority of the Act of July 25, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 123), including travel and such other purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper, and such amount may be expended without regard to the provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit): *Provided*, That, when in the discretion of the head of any other Government agency it would be in the public interest, personnel, services, supplies, equipment, and facilities of such agency may be furnished without reimbursement to the Commission for the purposes of these dedications.

70 Stat. 640.

During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $5,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for travel expenses (other than in connection with dedications of memorials).

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry on the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; not to exceed $12,000 for expenses of travel; advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission; hire of motor vehicles for field use only; and employment of aliens; $458,000, of which $50,000 shall be derived only from the war claims fund created by section 13(a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948) and not to be available for obligation after June 30, 1960.

60 Stat. 810.
62 Stat. 1247.
50 USC app. 2012.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

73 Stat. 164.
73 Stat. 165.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities Control Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $380,000.

60 Stat. 810.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. 201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $1,950.

60 Stat. 810.

Citizenship requirements.

SEC. 202. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the

Affidavit.

Penalty.

Exceptions.

current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

Living quarters allowances.

SEC. 203. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign countries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

46 Stat. 818.

60 Stat. 1025; 69 Stat. 27. 22 USC 1131.

73 Stat. 165. 73 Stat. 166. 22 USC 801 note.

Senate disapproval of nominees.

SEC. 204. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

USCA and Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 205. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

Administrative expenses.

SEC. 206. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

59 Stat. 597.

60 Stat. 810.

Office building.

SEC. 207. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building, without specific authority in law therefor, primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

Foreign credits.

SEC. 208. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952, or in this section

31 USC 724.

66 Stat. 662.

shall be construed to prevent the making of new or the carrying out of existing contracts, agreements, or executive agreements for periods in excess of one year, in any case where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements for periods in excess of one year were permitted prior to the enactment of this Act under section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1641(b)(2)), and the performance of all such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements shall be subject to the availability of appropriations for the purchase of credits as provided by law.

60 Stat. 754.

Publicity or propaganda.

SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

73 Stat. 166.

73 Stat. 167.

Statement of obligations.

SEC. 210. (a) Section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C. 200(b)), is amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, in connection with the submission of all requests for proposed appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget, the head of each Federal agency shall report that any statement of obligations furnished therewith consists of valid obligations as defined in subsection (a) hereof."

(b) Section 1(c) of the Act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 648; 31 U.S.C. 701(c)), is amended by striking the words "reported pursuant to section 1311(b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U.S.C. 200(b))."

Short title.

SEC. 211. This Act may be cited as the "General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1960".

Approved July 8, 1959.

GPO 34139